

relief for wounded veterans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

179. By Mr. DENISON: Petition of various citizens of Bush, Ill., in favor of beer and light wines and opposed to Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

180. Also, petition of various citizens of Cairo, Ill., in favor of beer and light wines and opposed to Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

181. Also, petition of various citizens and voters of Murphysboro, Ill., in favor of beer and light wines and opposed to Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

182. Also, petitions of various citizens and voters of Duquoin, Ill., in favor of beer and light wines and opposed to Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

183. Also, petition of citizens of Jonesboro, Ill., protesting against any revisions of the tariff on those classes of coal-tar products that are used in the manufacture of dips and disinfectants, such as creosote, phenol, naphthalene, and such other materials used in making insecticides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

184. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Frederick Douglass Council, of New York City, protesting against recruiting of colored troops for French army; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

185. Also, petition of Balch Price & Co., in connection with sales tax; the Federal Sugar Refining Co., in connection with Cuban sugar; and George Schneider & Co., protesting against tax on carbonated beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

186. Also, petition of the New York State League of Women's Voters, urging the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

187. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Daniel Miller Co., Baltimore, Md., protesting against certain features of tariff law; petition of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Baltimore, Md., protesting against proposed sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

188. Also, petitions of Baltimore Tube Co. and American Wholesale Corporation, Baltimore, Md., seeking proper protective legislation for the products manufactured by said concerns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

189. Also, petition of Burt Machine Co., Baltimore, Md., favoring Nolan Patent Office force and salary bill; to the Committee on Patents.

190. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of Mr. M. E. Ryan, Minneapolis, Minn., and sundry citizens of Minneapolis, petitioning the Congress of the United States to take the necessary action toward recognizing the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

191. Also, petition of Mr. M. H. O'Brien, Minneapolis, Minn., and other citizens of Minneapolis, petitioning the Congress of the United States to take the necessary action toward recognizing the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

192. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of secretary Mare Island Local, A. N. A. of Supervisors, of Mare Island, Calif., urging the support of an appropriation for dry dock at Mare Island, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

193. Also, petition of the Yolo County Board of Trade, of Woodland, Yolo County, Calif., urging tariff on tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

194. Also, petition of the Motors Car Dealers' Association, of Sacramento, Calif., relative to antidumping; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

195. Also, petition of the State board of directors of the Better America Federation of California, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the bill offered by Senator BORAH relative to free speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

196. Also petition of Local Union No. 538, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers, of Roseville, Calif., on the release of Eugene V. Debs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

197. By Mr. REED of West Virginia: Petition of West Virginia Consistory No. 1, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasons, urging passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

198. By Mr. WARD of North Carolina: Petition of New Hanover Teachers' Association, favoring Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

199. By Mr. YATES: Petition of General Federation of Women's Clubs, by Mrs. Edward Franklin White, chairman legislative department, Indianapolis, favoring the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 20, 1921.

(Legislative day of Monday, April 18, 1921.)

The Senate, in open executive session, met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

WILLIAM H. KING, a Senator from the State of Utah, and TASKER L. ODDIE, a Senator from the State of Nevada, appeared in their seats to-day.

TREATY WITH COLOMBIA.

The Senate, in open executive session and as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty with Colombia.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, most of the discussion that has taken place on the treaty has been in regard to the \$25,000,000 appropriation that is involved in it. While I consider the payment of that money as indefensible, I do not believe it is the most important proposition involved in the treaty. Much as I dislike the payment of that money, and I think it would be a sufficient reason, if standing alone, for the rejection of the treaty, yet I believe that the payment of that money is of comparatively small importance.

I wish to discuss, briefly, some of the other provisions of the treaty. I wish, if I can, to point out to the Senate just what is meant by the other provisions of the treaty, what it means to our Government, what it means to the world, and what it means to the taxpayers of the country.

First, there are provisions in the treaty giving to Colombia certain rights and privileges which, in my judgment, can not be defended. They are indefensible. They are inexcusable. I can not myself comprehend how any Senator can approve them, and that is true if they applied only to Colombia, but they have a much broader application, as I think will appear to every Senator who will give it careful and honest consideration.

The treaty provides, among other things:

The Republic of Colombia shall be at liberty at all times to transport through the interoceanic canal its troops, materials of war, and ships of war without paying any charges to the United States.

What defense can be made of that provision in the treaty? Why should we construct and build a canal at an expense of more than \$400,000,000 and spend millions of dollars annually in its maintenance and its upkeep, and then transport for Colombia her ships of war, the soldiers, the troops, the materials of war through the canal absolutely free? I have not made a computation, but it will cost the taxpayers of the Government of the United States a large sum of money every time it puts a ship through the canal. Is there any reason why we are called upon to pay the expense even of putting Colombian troops through the canal? Shall we give to Colombia rights that are superior to those of our own people?—and I shall show later on that we are doing that in the treaty. Can anyone give an excuse or a reason why we should take that course? Are we willing to go before the people of the United States and tell them frankly what we have done?

Let me read further from the treaty:

The products of the soil and the industry of Colombia passing through the canal, as well as the Colombian mails, shall be exempt from any charge or duty other than those to which the products and mails of the United States may be subject.

That would prohibit us from passing American ships through the canal free of tolls without giving the same privilege to Colombia. In practical effect that clause carries her mails through the canal free whether we take any further action beyond the approval of the treaty or not. Because we carry the mails of the United States through free, we will have to carry their mails through the canal free.

Again, the treaty provides:

The products of the soil and industry of Colombia, such as cattle, salt, and provisions—

And that includes everything, the products of the soil—shall be admitted to entry in the Canal Zone, and likewise in the islands and mainland occupied by the United States as auxiliary and accessory thereto, without paying other duties or charges than those payable by similar products of the United States.

Mr. President, it might in the wisdom of Congress later be decided that the products of Colombia and all other countries should be admitted to the Canal Zone free of duty. Our Government might some time decide upon that as a wise economic policy to pursue, but do we want to bind ourselves that when we admit the products of the United States in the Canal Zone free we shall be compelled on account of the provisions of the treaty to admit the products of Colombia free? Why should we thus extend the hand to Colombia? Who has offered any

reason for these provisions of the treaty? It is true there are Senators who believe Colombia has been wronged, but they are going to heal that wrong by the payment of \$25,000,000, provision for which is contained in the treaty.

I read again:

Colombian citizens crossing the Canal Zone shall, upon production of paper proof—

Remember it says paper proof, and we shall have to accept whatever is presented—

paper proof of their nationality, shall be exempt from every toll, tax, or duty to which the citizens of the United States are not subject.

To my mind it would be just as fair to say to the State of Virginia or the State of New York or some other part of the United States that we should extend a specific privilege and admit into their ports and their cities goods, provisions, and individuals on an entirely different basis from the balance of the country.

Again:

Whenever traffic by the canal is interrupted or whenever it shall be necessary for any other reason to use the railway, the troops, materials of war, products and mails of the Republic of Colombia, as above mentioned, shall be transported on the railway between Ancon and Cristobal, or any other railway substituted therefor, paying only the same charges and duties as are imposed upon the troops, materials of war, products and mails of the United States.

So that if the canal even is put out of business we must extend this same privilege and transport upon the railway the troops, munitions of war, and products of Colombia on the same basis that we transport our own. Since we own the railway I assume we do not charge for carrying our soldiers or materials of war and our mails. It follows therefore that we must carry those of Colombia absolutely free.

Again I read from the treaty:

The officers, agents, employees of the Government of Colombia shall, upon production of proper proof of their official character or their employment, also be entitled to passage on said railway on the same terms as officers, agents, and employees of the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I think it is true that practically every officer and official connected with the Government of the United States whose duty keeps him in Panama rides on a pass on that railroad. It is owned by the Government and it would be foolish to charge because we would only take it out of one pocket and put it in the other. It follows therefore that we must perform the same thing—we are obliged to do the same thing—in regard to all the officials of Colombia and all the officers of her army. No matter who, where, or what business they may be on, in effect we must carry them free of charge.

I read again:

Coal, petroleum, and sea salt, being the products of Colombia, for Colombian consumption, passing from the Atlantic coast of Colombia to any Colombian port on the Pacific coast, and vice versa, shall, whenever traffic by the canal is interrupted, be transported over the aforesaid railway free of any charge except the actual cost of handling and transportation, which shall not in any case—

Now, listen to this—

which shall not in any case exceed one-half of the ordinary freight charges levied upon similar products of the United States passing over the railway and in transit from one port to another of the United States.

We go further than putting Colombia on an equality with the United States. We transport these products not exceeding in any case the actual cost of transportation, and in no case shall that charge exceed one-half what we charge the American citizen for the same thing. Can anyone defend that? Have we been misrepresenting the thing to the American people, since we have been telling them that the canal was constructed for their benefit primarily and a world benefit incidentally? Can we go before the American people and defend the use of the taxpayers' funds in saying that we are going to transport over this railway the products of Colombia at one-half what we would charge an American citizen to transport the same thing over the same railway?

I can not understand that the ingenuity of men can concoct a defense for that kind of conduct. It cost us something to do this. Colombia paid nothing for the construction of the canal. Colombia paid nothing for the construction of the railway. She pays nothing for the maintenance of either the canal or the railway. That is all paid for out of the money of the United States Treasury; and now we propose by treaty to utilize these transportation facilities in some instances to carry the products of Colombia at one-half that which we shall charge the American who built the canal and who furnished the money not only to build it but to keep it up.

If that were the end of it, Mr. President, it would not be so grave; if that were all, we might by a stretch of imagination charge it up to our desire to be liberal; but that is only the foundation for something much more in the way of a sacrifice

that must be borne by the American people. We have with every civilized nation on earth treaties of peace and amity, and I think, without exception, in every one of them is the clause which is known as the favored-nation clause, by which it is agreed that if we give in commerce to any other nation not a party to that treaty any right or any privilege, ipso facto that same right and privilege will be extended to the other party to the treaty; which means that if we extend to Colombia any privilege or any right we thereby, by virtue of the favored-nation clause of those other treaties, extend it to every country on earth with which we have such a treaty, which practically means all of them. So, while by the terms of the pending treaty we are extending special privileges to Colombia, in legal effect we are extending them to all the world. England, France, Spain, Norway, Sweden, and all other countries will demand, and will have a right to demand, that every privilege we have given in this treaty to Colombia shall be extended to them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I suppose the Senator from Nebraska is aware that Great Britain, which claims a special interest in the canal under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, has filed a protest against this treaty for the very reason just stated by the Senator from Nebraska. It is true that, at the special request of our Government, Great Britain waived her protest, but she did not agree, and never has agreed, that she may not renew it at any time in the future.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator from Washington for his interruption. It reminds me of another treaty stipulation which exists between this Government and Great Britain in the so-called Hay-Pauncefote treaty, by which it is expressly stated when the canal shall be built—the treaty having been made before the canal was constructed—that the rules and regulations provided for the government of the proposed canal by the Government of the United States shall extend equal privileges to all the nations of the world. So when we extend this privilege to Colombia there are two reasons why we must extend it to every other nation.

Mr. President, the effect of this treaty is practically to turn the canal over to the world, retaining in the United States only the sacred privilege of paying the expenses of the canal and of keeping it up. The effect is to make it free to everybody at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States, not for to-day, not for to-morrow, not for this year only, but through all time. Do you want to take that proposition to the taxpayers and the voters of the United States? Can you give some reason why we should do that? If so, you must go further than anybody else has gone who has offered any reason here on this floor for the approval of the treaty. So that, as time shall come and pass, the expenditure will not be merely \$25,000,000, but it will be hundreds of millions of dollars, to be paid by the taxpayers of the United States for the benefit of the commerce of other nations.

I do not believe that a fair and honest consideration of the treaty can lead any American citizen to the conclusion that we should give all these special privileges to the balance of the world. I know that it might be said that these privileges are given to Colombia on the theory that in this same treaty Colombia gives something to the United States; that any other nation desiring to take advantage of the provisions of the treaty must give the same things which Colombia gives. Now let us see what she does. She does just two things: She acknowledges the independence of Panama and the title of the United States in the canal. Every other nation on earth has already done that. So there will be no delay, so far as other nations are concerned, in complying with the same conditions that Colombia is required to comply with in order to get the benefit of these privileges. We will keep the canal up through all time. It costs millions of dollars every year to maintain the canal; it cost more than \$400,000,000 to construct it; it cost \$40,000,000 to buy the rights of the French Canal Co.; it cost \$10,000,000 in the shape of a payment to Panama; it afterwards cost \$250,000 a year in annuities to Panama. All that comes from the Treasury of the United States; and yet this treaty, in effect, turns the canal over to the world. What particular benefit is it to own something that everybody else uses without paying anything for it, while you must keep it up? What particular benefit would it be to a farmer to own a fine team if he had to feed it and pay for it and take care of it and let his neighbor use it all the time for nothing?

Mr. President, we are starting out in a new Congress the watchword of which was economy. In very beautiful and

forceful language, in which I think we all concurred, we were advised by the President to be economical; and yet when we are assumed to be carrying out economy, in every concrete proposition that has so far been proposed the expenditures of the Government have been increased rather than diminished. We are urged to inaugurate an era of economical administration of Government, and we start it by giving away \$25,000,000 at once and agreeing to keep up at our expense forever, at a cost of many million dollars, a canal that has involved the expenditure of millions upon millions for the benefit of the balance of the world, and in some instances we give the balance of the world privileges that we do not give to our own citizens. I can not comprehend how such a course can be defended.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. Before the Senator from Nebraska passes altogether from the subject he was discussing a moment ago, I desire to ask him whether he has in his mind not only our general treaties of peace and amity and commerce, in which there is contained the favored-nation clause, but another treaty under which, in effect, the Panama Canal was built, made with Great Britain, namely, the Hay-Pauncefote treaty?

Mr. NORRIS. I have already referred to that treaty.

Mr. CUMMINS. I was not aware of that fact.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I had them both in mind, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. In that treaty we specifically agreed with Great Britain, and, through Great Britain, with the rest of the world, that the ships of all nations shall pass through the Panama Canal "on terms of entire equality." The only question that has ever arisen here, as I understand, in connection with that provision, is whether the United States is included within the term "all nations." I have always contended, and I think it is the right position, that we were saying this to the rest of the world, and that we have a perfect right to pass our own ships through upon such terms as we may determine. I can not understand how anyone can escape the conclusion that the pending treaty is a positive, plain, palpable violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington, but I hope the Senator will be brief.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will be very brief. I can hardly refrain from pointing out at this juncture in the Senator's able discussion and in support of the suggestions which he has made and which the Senator from Iowa has just made, a letter from Mr. Whitelaw Reid, American ambassador to Great Britain, addressed to Mr. Elihu Root, then Secretary of State of the United States, from the American Embassy in London, dated January 11, 1909, in which our ambassador quotes Sir Charles Hardinge, who was acting as the minister of foreign affairs in the absence of Sir Edward Grey, as making the statement, "We shall have to enter a protest" under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty against the proposed concession to Colombia which the Senator from Nebraska has just been discussing.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank both Senators. I had, however, I will say to the Senator from Iowa, already alluded to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and had called attention to the particular clause to which he has referred, although I did not have the treaty before me, and did not quote it. I will say, however, that I agree with the Senator from Iowa also that, under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, we have a right to do anything we please in regard to our own ships. That, in my judgment, is the correct legal conclusion to reach, and, although I voted in favor of exacting a toll upon American shipping, believing that it was justified, I said at the time when that question was before the Senate, that I believed we had a right to pass our ships through absolutely free if we wanted to, and I think that is the general American viewpoint. It is borne out by reason and logic, I think, and I assume that practically all Americans who have studied the subject have reached that conclusion.

Mr. President, there are several reasons given why we should approve this treaty. One given by those who concur with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is that, whereas we have done a wrong to Colombia, therefore we should pay for it. Those Senators are logical in supporting this treaty, but they are illogical when they want to strike out the apology that was originally contained in the treaty. If we have wronged Colombia, we ought not only to pay the damages, but we ought to apologize for the wrong.

Then comes the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], who gives us in a logical and forceful manner a review of what

happened in Panama and demonstrates, I think, to a practical mathematical certainty that we did no wrong at Panama; that our title to the canal is clear and honest, without a cloud. That far I go with the Senator from Pennsylvania in his able address; but after he has demonstrated that, he then says: "We ought to pay Colombia something because she lost something, and we gained something. Colombia," he says, "by her own wrongful act lost a good deal of money. We ought to pay it back."

Mr. President, I have not very much sympathy for Colombia under the circumstances. If I had time to go into the original conditions down there in Panama when she seceded from Colombia, I think I could show that Colombia is not entitled to any sympathy. But let us assume for the sake of the argument that she is: Are we going to give Colombia \$25,000,000 because she lost some money, and, in addition thereto, expend from the Treasury of the United States for her benefit other hundreds of millions of dollars as the years go on, to make good what we have given her outside of the cash payment? Are we going to do that because we sympathize?

Why, Mr. President, if we are in the business to that extent, we must not stop with Colombia. We can take up half of the nations; yes, practically all of the nations of the world to-day. Many of them have done wrongful things and have suffered terribly. Shall we pay the bills so that they will not suffer loss? Are we under any more obligation to pay Colombia because by her wrongful act she lost some money than we are to pay any other nation or any other people because they lost some money, sometimes without committing a wrongful act?

The Senator says we made some money by the transaction. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the United States from the very beginning has paid more than she ought to have paid for every concession that she ever got in regard to the Panama Canal, unless it be the money that was paid to the French company, with the details of which I am not so familiar. Instead of our paying for the privilege of making a yellow-fever pest-hole a healthful and beautiful place, the right thing would have been to pay us for doing it. Without the canal, without the railroad down there on the Isthmus of Panama, that country would amount to nothing. It was practically worthless. It was a place where civilized men could not live. We have made it one of the healthiest places on the globe, and every time we did something to help it we paid somebody for the privilege of doing it. I am tired of doing that. I believe the taxpayers of America are tired of doing it; and we are going to have a hard time to make the taxpayer—who is now overburdened and bowed down to the earth, almost, with taxation—assume this load and feel happy about it.

But, Mr. President, there is another class of people who are for this treaty besides the two I have mentioned, and that is the class over here on the Republican side who are for it because the President wants it.

I listened yesterday to the very eloquent and forceful speech of the junior Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], about half of which was devoted to that particular proposition: Our President has asked for it, and in a beautiful message he had requested us to approve this treaty.

Mr. President, are we to approve the treaty because the President wants it? Is it any disrespect to the President of the United States if a Senator votes against it. Are we so handicapped here by party affiliation that I, being a member of the same party with the President, will not dare vote against this treaty without being properly censured for doing so? Have we come to that stage of our political existence? If we have, Mr. President, then not only ought we to put an apology in the treaty that we are considering, but the Republican membership of the Senate ought to meet at once and send an apology over to the Democratic side for what we said about them when Mr. Wilson was President, and when we charged them with being rubber stamps.

Is it a crime to disregard your own convictions and follow the President when he is a Democrat, and a virtue to do the same thing when he is a Republican? If that is true, Mr. President, all of us being pledged to economy, we ought to take another step. We ought to amend the Constitution and abolish the Senate. If every man must follow the President regardless of what he thinks, then, instead of paying the salaries of 96 Senators, we ought to invest \$4 or \$5 in 96 rubber stamps and send them up to the White House and save the salaries of all these statesmen here who are only obeying the command of somebody at the other end of the Avenue.

I protest that in my opposition to this treaty I am not disrespectful to the President, and that I am under no obligation of any kind to support this treaty or any other legislation simply because he wants it approved.

The President was a Member of this body. He was on the Committee on Foreign Relations. He had given some consideration, I presume, to this treaty that was pending before that committee while he was a member of it. I have never heard him say that he was against it, but until he became President I never heard him say that he was for it; and as far as the control of the vote of any Member of the Senate is concerned, why should the wish of a man who has been a Member of this body, and who is put into the White House as President, be any more forceful than it was when he was a Member of this body?

To my mind it is not paying the President the proper respect to say that we are going to vote for a treaty or a law just because he wants it; and yet the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], when he was making that argument, was giving the reason that, in my judgment, controls a large number of votes in this body.

I think the Senators who take that position are wrong. But it is true that a large number of Senators who were originally against this treaty are now for it. This number includes the illustrious Republican leader on this side. They changed because the President requested them to change, but not until Roosevelt was dead. I have heard some of them argue, and I have not myself heard any of them give a reason that seemed to me to be sufficient or logical. So I believe it can be truthfully said that we are presented now with this condition—that the request of the President that this treaty be ratified by the Senate is sufficient in itself to change a minority into a majority, and I presume we are going to have it ratified for that reason.

If that is the right kind of government, I repeat that we ought to abolish Congress and elect a President who has legislative powers, as well as executive powers. If that theory of government is the right one, then we should abolish the Republic and establish upon its ruins an absolute monarchy.

I listened to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the very able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who before was very bitterly opposed to this treaty, and who is on record and who has signed a minority report in which it is severely condemned. It is condemned more severely in that report than I have condemned it. That report has been read to the Senate, and I am not going to repeat it; but the Senator devoted considerable time to showing, and in fact said in answer to a question that I propounded to him, that one of the reasons for the approval of this treaty was to get the good will of Colombia; that a vast amount of oil existed in Colombia, and investors could go in there and be protected if Colombia were friendly.

Again, Mr. President, before I refer to a map that the Senator from Massachusetts offered in evidence, let me say, as he said when he signed the minority report, "We can not afford to buy the friendship of any country." We want the friendship of all countries, but if we are going to establish the precedent that we will pay \$25,000,000 for the good will of Colombia, how much ought we to pay for the good will of Great Britain? If Colombia's good will and smiles are worth \$25,000,000, then how much should we give to France for her good will? How much to Brazil? How much to Japan? And, mark you, we are not only paying \$25,000,000 to Colombia, but we are obligating ourselves to pay hundreds of millions of dollars in the years that shall come in the maintenance of this canal for her benefit and the benefit of the balance of the world. Ought we to establish a schedule and pay for the good will of other governments according to the population or according to the geographical extent of the country or according to the amount of oil that they have in their bosoms? Upon what basis shall we build up a schedule? Shall we say that we will pay nations alike \$25,000,000 and that we will give to Liberia just the same as we will give to Great Britain?

We should have some trouble with that schedule. Great Britain would object to that, and I think properly. If it is worth \$25,000,000 to be paid to Colombia to get her to smile at us, it ought to be worth at least \$250,000,000 to insure always the good will of Great Britain; and when we get through with the schedule where will we be, and, for God's sake, where will the American taxpayer be?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. I am surprised that the Senator should ask the question where the American taxpayer will be. We will make it up in Colombian oil.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes. Mr. President, the Colombian oil which the Senator speaks of will not reach the Treasury of the United States. It is doubtful if that will ever get beyond Wall

Street, and if the oil interests of the country are anxious to develop that country, and it is necessary to pay some Government to have the Government good, let the oil, rather than the Treasury of the United States, pay for the smiles we are trying to get.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. It would not be so bad, Mr. President, if this treaty actually settled the oil question. But if there are ever controversies over the oil situation in Colombia, we will have to pay for it again, because this treaty does not purport to deal with the thing which they say it is intended to settle.

Mr. NORRIS. No; Mr. President, that is true; oil is not mentioned; it only comes in incidentally, and I believe when the oil business comes up we will have to pay again. In fact, you never paid blackmail in your life but what, when the fellow got out of money, he came back for some more; and I am justified in using the word "blackmail," because the great Senator from Massachusetts used it, as I remember, in his minority report. If we buy Colombia to-day, how long will she stay bought; and if we pay \$25,000,000, how much of it is ever going to get to Colombia?

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] gave us a world map of the oil situation, centering in Great Britain, controlling the oil of the world, and I do not know why he offered us that and talked about it unless he believed that if we approve this treaty either one of two things must happen—Great Britain would lose her control of the oil fields of the world or we would get more oil fields in our control. About as many of the lines on this beautiful map, which run out from London to all parts of the world, come into the United States as any other place. If this map proves anything, it proves that England is controlling the oil output of America now, and who has been bold enough to say that if we approve this treaty England will withdraw from the oil fields of America and let us have them ourselves? And if we pay \$25,000,000 to Colombia to oust Great Britain of oil control in Colombia, how much must we pay to deprive her of oil control in Mesopotamia; how much in Mexico; how much in South America; how much in our country? And so with the other countries. The oil map of the Senator from Massachusetts shows that Great Britain controls the oil of the world. If the Senator's argument has any application to this treaty, which I question very much, it is that we may buy enough of the nations of the earth to get that control away from Great Britain, and that we should commence with Colombia by approving this treaty.

Mr. President, it does seem to me that we ought to hesitate before we ask the American people to assume this new burden, a burden that is not measured by \$25,000,000, a burden that is going to rest upon the backs and the shoulders of American citizens yet unborn, at a time when Congress is hunting for every possible source of taxation, at a time when the people are crying out because of being overburdened with taxation, at a time when we have promised to the people of America that we would call a halt on extravagance and administer the Government and its affairs with economy and efficiency.

You can not measure the actual cost in dollars and cents which will result when we have to turn the canal open to the world. You can not measure it, Mr. President, short of billions, instead of millions; and it is no defense for us that a good share of the burden will be paid by those who shall follow.

I can see how those who feel that Colombia was wronged might desire to do something; but even those men, it seems to me, ought to assist in striking out of this treaty every one of these special concessions I have read, and I can not see how those—and they constitute a large majority of the Senate and of the American people—who feel we have done no injustice to Colombia can now at this date, when we are confronted with a bonded indebtedness the interest on which amounts to more than the entire cost of the Government before the war, dare go before the American people and try to justify this outrageous expense.

There is no defense, Mr. President, on the surface, and none that has appeared in the light. The President in his message, with due respect to him, gave no reason. Mr. President, we can not afford to do this. The money we are dealing with is not ours. We are occupying a position of trust. We ought to be more careful with the public funds than with our own individual money. We have no license from the people to approve this treaty. We have no license from the men who must bear the burden and pay the money to squander this great sum. We have no license from the American people to take that canal practically out from American control and throw it open to the

commerce of the world. If the American people want to do that, it ought to be after that has been an issue and when they have had an opportunity to be heard.

I think we are violating our pledges when we ruthlessly, without cause and without reason, in this manner not only squander American funds but surrender American rights in the canal, a canal built with the approval of the American people, with their money, at their risk, supposed to be an American proposition. Nobody else paid anything toward its construction; nobody else did anything toward its construction; the greatest engineering feat of the world, the pride of every American citizen. Yet we are now upon the verge of an action which, if carried into logical effect, will turn it over to the world, and we will have nothing but a naked title, with an obligation through the centuries which are to come to raise millions and hundreds of millions of dollars by taxation to keep it open and keep it in repair for the benefit of the world.

That may be the wish of some; but, Mr. President, if that is the idea, then why not do it openly and aboveboard? Why not pass a law in which we say, "This canal, the result of American toil and American genius, is turned over to the world free, and we will guarantee through all time to come to keep it running and to put your ships through for nothing"? Why do it in an indirect way? Why not do it aboveboard, so that the people of the United States can see at once just what we are doing?

I think, Mr. President, we ought to hesitate, and we ought to hesitate long, before we take this step, which, in my judgment, will bring consequences of disaster not only to individuals but to our country through many, many years of the future.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment. I ask that it may be read and remain pending until the hour for a vote upon it has arrived.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the fourth line of section 2 of article 1, on page 2, strike out the words "the United States may be subject" and insert in lieu thereof "nations other than the United States may be subject under the treaties and laws of the United States."

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask that the clause be read as it would read as proposed to be amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. As proposed to be amended it would read:

2. The products of the soil and industry of Colombia passing through the canal, as well as the Colombian mails, shall be exempt from any charge or duty other than those to which the products and mails of nations other than the United States may be subject under the treaties and laws of the United States—

And so forth.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I offer the following amendment and ask that it be read and lie over until the time for voting has arrived.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the last line on the second page, in article 2, strike out the word "twenty-five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifteen." The article, if amended as proposed by the committee, reads:

The Government of the United States of America agrees to pay at the city of Washington to the Republic of Colombia the sum of \$25,000,000, gold, United States money, as follows—

And so forth. As proposed to be amended it would read:

The Government of the United States of America agrees to pay at the city of Washington to the Republic of Colombia the sum of \$15,000,000, gold, United States money, as follows—

And so forth.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I offer the following amendment and ask that it be read and lie over until the hour for voting arrives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Strike out section 1 of Article I on page 2, in the following words:

The Republic of Colombia shall be at liberty at all times to transport through the interoceanic canal its troops, materials of war, and ships of war, without paying any charges to the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will lie on the table for the present.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I think no one can exaggerate the importance of the relations of the United States with the Republics to the south of us in Central and South America. There can be no doubt that by a gradual process of development there is being built up in that great continent a civilization which will ever, in increasing measure, make

its impress upon the world. The South American Continent and Central America, so called, are to-day dotted with self-governing Republics, many of which have had stormy experiences, it is true, but all of which, I am inclined to believe, are slowly but surely reaching a condition where their Governments are stable, and will be enabled in the future to go ahead in a progressive and sane manner.

During the years that have passed the relations of the United States to those Governments have been exceedingly peculiar. We have been a great, strong, stable Republic founded upon a philosophy of politics and social existence which to many of them was unknown or little understood. Due to the fact that we have succeeded, measurably, at self-government and also the fact that we are endowed with immense riches and powers, our relation to them has been, perhaps, somewhat paternal. I imagine that expression coming from a Senator of the United States is not entirely pleasing to all the people who inhabit the Republics to the south of us. Nevertheless that has been the fact and it has been the attitude which the people of this country have very generally taken, especially when one comes to consider the Monroe doctrine and its application.

These relations, as I said, have been most peculiar, and it has been exceedingly difficult for the United States from time to time to make its attitude thoroughly understood among those Republics. I think I am not very far wrong when I say that upon more than one occasion we have bungled in maintaining those relations and upon more than one occasion have injured the sensibilities of proud peoples who have failed to understand, and I do not blame them for failing to understand, our attitude with respect to certain matters.

The result has been, and everyone knows it, that a feeling of suspicion and antagonism is prevalent throughout large areas of Central and South America, suspicion and antagonism against the United States, much of which I believe unwarranted and undeserved by us, but some of it warranted and deserved. I said a moment ago that we had bungled, in my judgment, in some of our undertakings, and I am going to refer to them very briefly and then ask my colleagues in the Senate if they do not think this treaty is another instance of bungling in much the same way that we have bungled upon former occasions.

Shortly after I became a Member of this body the American administration negotiated a treaty with the Republic of Nicaragua. The treaty was ratified and is now binding upon the two Republics. Let us look back a moment and see what led up to that treaty and then what followed upon its heels. At the outset let me say that I voted for it, and I confess to my colleagues that I did not understand all that it meant or what would follow upon its heels. Had I so understood at the time I should not have voted for it, and if a modification of it should be presented to the Senate by this or any other administration I should vote for its substantial modification.

Back in 1911, I think it was, the United States felt it absolutely necessary to intervene in the internal affairs of the Republic of Nicaragua. Probably that intervention was necessary. There had continued a distressing state of affairs in that Republic for some time, one revolution following upon another until there was no security of life or property and the legitimate interests of Americans as well as the legitimate interests of other foreigners were jeopardized to an extreme degree. In any event a substantial force of American marines was landed—I think ultimately they amounted to something like 2,000 men—and made what was the equivalent of an invasion of that country, finally taking possession of the city of Managua, its capital, quelling the disturbances with a strong hand—and I have no criticism of that whatsoever—and setting up a Government headed by a president.

The creation of that Government, it was well known at the time and must be conceded now, was entirely dependent upon the support of the United States, and as bearing out that assertion may I remind the Senate that ever since that time there has been a garrison of American marines in the city of Managua. I think there are only 100 of them, but the number is unimportant. Their mere presence indicates the necessity for continued support by the United States of that Government which we set up in Nicaragua. It may be a good government. I do not know. It may be that some other government chosen more freely by the people of Nicaragua would be a better government. I do not know about that. I am not competent to pass upon it. But the fact is that we set up the Government at the time and we have maintained it ever since to a large extent regardless of the opinions of the people of Nicaragua.

Having set up the Government we proceeded to make a treaty with it, the treaty to which I referred a moment ago. Under that treaty the United States paid to the Republic of Nicaragua

a substantial sum of money. Perhaps some of my colleagues can remind me of the amount; I can not remember it just now. This was to be applied, as I recollect, upon its national debt and in the satisfaction of various debts owed or incurred by the Government which had preceded the one which we set up. In return for the payment of that money Nicaragua undertook to cede to the United States certain things of value. One of the things which she ceded to the United States under that treaty was the exclusive right vested in this country to use the so-called Nicaraguan canal route using the San Juan River as part of that route. In addition to that under the same treaty Nicaragua ceded to the United States certain most important rights in the Gulf of Fonseca upon the western coast of Central America, and those rights indicate very clearly that we would have a right at any time to make use of that gulf as a naval station for the use of our own naval vessels.

This treaty, made with the government which we ourselves set up and for which we were entirely responsible, was a treaty really made with ourselves. It was undoubtedly of tremendous advantage to the United States; certainly we received value for the money which we spent under it. It turns out, however, that while that treaty was under consideration Costa Rica, through the appropriate diplomatic channels, protested against the right of Nicaragua to make any such cession of the San Juan River without her consent, contending, as she had a perfect right to contend, that the San Juan River was the boundary between Nicaragua and Costa Rica, and that Nicaragua had no right to give the United States a 99-year lease on the river without the consent of the other riparian owner. The American Government and the American Senate paid no attention to that protest and went ahead and ratified the treaty.

It turns out that about the same time the Republic of Honduras, which owns a part of the littoral of Fonseca Bay, on the west coast, protested to the United States, as I recollect, that Nicaragua had no right, acting entirely by herself, to cede to the United States naval-station rights on Fonseca Bay without the consent of Honduras. It may be, although my recollection is somewhat inaccurate, that the Republic of Salvador joined in that same protest. Salvador, like Honduras, owned a part of the littoral of Fonseca Bay. No attention was paid to those protests and the treaty went through.

It so happens also that some years prior to this time the American Government very properly and very wisely gave great encouragement to the Central American Republics in the proposal to set up an international Central American court. Those Republics had been at sword points for many, many years, and it was charged one against the other upon many an occasion that they were guilty of unneutral acts in harboring revolutionists and inspiring insurrection within the territories of their neighbors. The United States, I think I am correct in saying, led the way in helping the Central American Republics to set up an international court which should settle the disputes which might arise between the Central American Republics. That court was in existence at the time the United States made the treaty with Nicaragua.

Following the making of the treaty the Republic of Costa Rica appealed to the court, brought its case before the court, and the court listened to the case. The International Court of Central America handed down a decision sustaining the protest of Costa Rica and the United States paid no attention. The court promptly disbanded.

Now, that is the kind of thing that hurts the reputation of the United States all over Central and South America. The blow which we delivered indirectly against international arbitration in Central America was a heavy one, and to-day we stand possessed, in my judgment, of rights ceded to us by Nicaragua which Nicaragua had no right to cede to us, and the Central American court handed down a decision to that effect.

There are other instances—

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not, assuming the treaty to which the Senator refers did grant naval rights in the bay, the United States ever attempted to assert those rights?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think not.

Mr. KING. Has not the United States acted passively and taken no part in the decision and not controverted it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but the treaty still stands. And the same may be said about the San Juan River. We have not started to build a canal through the San Juan River and Lake Nicaragua along the so-called Nicaragua route, but we believe ourselves to-day to be the owners of a 99-year lease on

that canal route. We acquired that lease or that cession from a country which the international court of Central America said had no right to give it to us. We had helped to set up the court, were largely responsible for it. Those things hurt.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, if we had asserted any right under the treaty and had proceeded to establish a naval base or had asserted a claim under the 99-year lease, a proprietary interest thereunder, I think the Senator's contention would contain very much merit.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, my criticism is against the making of any such treaty without having the cooperation of the other parties in legitimate interest. We might just as well have taken into consideration the people of Costa Rica, the people of Honduras, and the people of Salvador and made a joint treaty with them all. We declined to do that. They protested here against our making a treaty with Nicaragua alone, but we paid no attention to the protest.

The time may come when the United States will desire to avail itself of the advantages given to it under the treaty with Nicaragua. It may be that we shall desire to establish a coal-station for our Navy at Fonseca Bay. That is a most valuable privilege and one which I sincerely hope the United States will possess. That bay is the one sheet of water along that whole western coast of Central America—a coast thousands of miles in length—which is suitable for a naval base to shelter a fleet. It may be needed to protect the western approaches to the Panama Canal. Strategically it is of enormous value. When we do come—if we ever do come—to use Fonseca Bay as a naval station, it may be that then Honduras and Salvador will again protest that we have not a clear title. If they do, I hope the administration in power at Washington at that time will take into consideration the history of this transaction and see to it that those people are dealt with fairly and squarely.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I suggest to the Senator from New York that it is not quite accurate, possibly, to say that Nicaragua had no right either in the river or in the bay?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; she had a right.

Mr. FLETCHER. She certainly had some right.

Mr. WADSWORTH. She did, but she did not have the whole thing.

Mr. FLETCHER. And under the treaty we obtained whatever right Nicaragua had. Whether Costa Rica and San Salvador also have rights is a matter which might arise when we undertook to exercise the authority given us under the treaty; but, at present, anyway, we have done no more than get, as it were, a quit-claim deed from Nicaragua for whatever right she may have had, both in the river and in the bay.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not familiar with all the technicalities concerning the rights Nicaragua may or may not have ceded to us, but the fact is that when the treaty was pending Costa Rica protested, and we would not even listen; and when Costa Rica took her case to a court which we helped set up and the court brought in a verdict in her favor we would not listen.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is quite true; but at the same time Costa Rica did not have any right to say that Nicaragua could not do what Nicaragua was attempting to do. We could proceed with Nicaragua, as we did proceed, without interfering with the rights of Costa Rica. Costa Rica has rights and can take care of them when the time comes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, one of the elements which added more to the suspicion and resentment which arose against us was that we were really making a treaty with ourselves.

Mr. President, those things hurt. I am impelled to speak frankly about it here, because such matters are seldom frankly discussed. They hurt the reputation of this country. They hurt us throughout those vast regions to the south of us. There are other incidents that have occurred that have hurt us tremendously. I say these things because I respect the people to the south of us. I do not despise them; I do not ignore them. They represent a great and growing civilization which is becoming more and more important, and more important to the people of the United States than to any people on the face of the earth.

I do not intend and I shall not attempt to bring up a partisan discussion of any kind, but another thing that hurt was the forcible intervention at Vera Cruz, which seemed to all South America like an attempt upon the part of the Government and the people of the United States by force of arms, with a fleet of battleships and thousands and thousands of sailors and

marines, to control the internal affairs of a so-called friendly neighbor. The news of that act swept everywhere and added to our difficulties in dealing with those people.

I am not familiar with what has been going on in Santo Domingo; indeed, I must confess, Mr. President, that I am not familiar with all the things that led up to our intervention in Santo Domingo. In my humble judgment that intervention was necessary and wise in the last analysis, but somehow or other we have not known how to explain it to the South American people; and to-day Santo Domingans, wherever they may be found in South or Central America, are challenging the representatives of the United States, be they diplomatic or commercial, to state our policy as to Santo Domingo. We have not handled these matters well. We have injured the feelings of thousands and hundreds of thousands of intelligent, civilized people. I have encountered the reaction from this situation in my conversations with members of our own Diplomatic Service. We have many ministers who are accredited to South American and Central American countries; we have in those countries secretaries of embassy and secretaries of legation. Occasionally it has been my privilege to encounter a returning secretary of an embassy or a legation, an American, and to ask him to tell me how fares the reputation of the United States in those countries; and in many instances the report comes back that, for one reason or another, the United States is suspected. I think it is true, probably, that interested politicians in those countries fan that flame for their own purposes upon occasions, capitalize it politically within their countries. But that it exists can not be denied.

To my mind the strange thing about this situation is—although it is perhaps not so strange; it is human on their part—that many of the men who have served the United States in diplomatic capacities in Central or South America come back and say, "For heaven's sake, pay Colombia some money and that will ease the situation; settle this controversy with Colombia and we shall be less embarrassed in our negotiations and in our conversations, official and otherwise, with the peoples to whom we are accredited."

More than one of them—and perhaps some Senators have had the same experience—while contending that we do not owe Colombia one penny, still say, "Oh, well, let us pay them the money and bring about a better feeling toward us." I can understand how an American diplomatic officer is annoyed and distressed by what he may encounter upon occasion in a South American or Central American capital. Figuratively speaking, around the corner from the American legation is the Colombian legation, and the American minister, anxious to advance the interests of his own people and charged with that duty under the instructions of the State Department and the President, is very apt to find that the Colombian minister around the corner is always doing his best to poison the mind of the Government to which he is accredited against the Government and the people of the United States. Information has come to me recently that the Dominicans are endeavoring to do that very thing, and that whenever any systematic effort is made by our Government—sincerely made—with the best of motives, to establish a better understanding, the Dominicans are doing their best to destroy that understanding.

Of course, that is a very disagreeable experience for an American minister or secretary of legation to encounter, and upon every occasion as to which I have made inquiries along that line I have found that there is a strong body of opinion in the American Diplomatic Service accredited to South America that the \$25,000,000 should be paid to Colombia, stating frankly that they hope that that payment will relieve them of this annoyance and make their lives and the lives of an ordinary American in those countries a little more comfortable.

Mr. President, I think you will find that a large number of the officers of our own State Department argue exactly along that line. That is the plea which they have made to more than one person clothed with authority in the matter of treaties, but it is a plea which I believe if acceded to will simply add one more blunder to the long list of which we are already guilty.

Let us leave out of this discussion for just a moment the right and wrong of the incident that occurred on the Isthmus in 1903 and suppose that we do ratify the treaty. It is said we will get the good will of the people of Colombia by paying them this money, and it is further argued that it will help our standing all over South America by not only paying the money but by giving Colombia the special privileges in the canal which it is proposed to give her. Mr. President, what we will get from the people of Colombia will be a smile of a somewhat jeering kind. It can not possibly add to the respect which the people of Colombia will have for this country to pay them \$25,000,000; and, after all, what we are after is the respect of these people.

We do not want them to fear us; we do not want them to dread us; we do not want them to truckle to us. We want them to respect us, and no man can tell me that the Colombian people are going to respect the Government and people of the United States for \$25,000,000 or any other sum. We gain nothing along the line which has been suggested here by the payment of this money. We will simply add one more mistake to the ones we have already made.

And what will the other countries of South America think about this thing? This treaty gives the right to Colombia to pass her ships of war, her troops, and her war materials through the canal at all times free of charge. In other words, we give to the Republic of Colombia the same thing that Germany demanded of Belgium—the right to transport troops, guns, munitions, and ships in time of war, to be used against some neighbor of Colombia. Germany demanded the right to send her armies through Belgium to attack France, violating the neutrality of Belgium, putting France at the mercy of Germany. But the world stood aghast at the proposal; it brought the British Empire into the war against Germany; it put all the moral forces of the world against Germany. But here we propose to make the Canal Zone, the canal and the railroad which we built, a pathway along which Colombia, and Colombia alone, may transport troops free of charge to be launched against any enemy of Colombia.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Of course the Senator has noted that the clause granting the privilege of such transportation in time of war is stricken out of the treaty?

Mr. WADSWORTH. But the treaty still says, may I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts, "at all times."

Mr. BORAH. That is precisely, if I may be permitted to say so, what has not been done.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the point. If it said "in peace times only," it would be thoroughly understood; but let me read it. The treaty provides that—

Colombia shall be at liberty at all times to transport through the interoceanic canal its troops, materials of war, and ships of war without paying any charges to the United States.

Mr. LODGE. The clause "even in case of war between Colombia and another country" is stricken from the treaty.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That clause was mere surplusage.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The sentence that was stricken out was mere surplusage.

Mr. LODGE. It was not surplusage.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The words "even in case of war between Colombia and another country" are proposed to be stricken out, but the words "at all times" remain. Those words mean peace times and war times, and Colombia will have a right to make that claim.

Mr. BORAH. Why would it not be just as logical to say that she could not send her ships and materials through in peace times, but could only send them through in war times?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That, it seems to me, would be equally logical.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely, because she can send them "at all times," and that includes any time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It seems to me that illustrates another one of the embarrassments that would come to the United States through this treaty. If we should make any such claim as is now suggested under this language, after having made a solemn compact with Colombia that at all times she could send her munitions of war and troops of war through the canal, then if we should come to the application of it and say, "Oh, this did not mean when you are at war," it would make the United States perfectly ridiculous.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, of course we can not tell what may happen in South America in the years that are to come. I wish I could announce to the Senate my solemn conviction that war would never break out again anywhere, but I can not. I am afraid it will, some time. Colombia may be a party to it, one of the belligerents. Her antagonist may be a South American neighbor. Suppose, for example, it were Venezuela. Look at the map. Colombia could transport her troops and ships of war and war materials from the western coast through the American canal, expedite them on their way, with American help, to be launched upon the shores of Venezuela upon the Atlantic coast of South America. Venezuela would not be permitted to send her troops free of charge from the

Atlantic coast to be launched against Colombia on the Pacific coast.

Mr. President, this matter of neutrality, the rights of neutrals and the duties of neutrals in time of war, is a matter of exceeding importance. This Government of ours has always taken a very strong, high stand about the duty of a neutral. It never has permitted itself to give advantage to one belligerent as against another, and I hope it never will. All international law forbids it as a general principle, and the failure to live up to the principles and ideals of neutrality when the world is afire is a thing which is apt to bring down upon the head of the country which fails to do it a great deal of trouble and suffering in the end. Now, I say, we can not tell what may eventuate in this poor old world, but I dread the day when the United States gives to one nation the right to use its territory—the territory of the United States—as a highway over which to attack another nation. There is nothing that is better calculated to drag the United States into trouble than a treaty provision such as that.

We are accustomed to look at these things in a rather casual manner, because Colombia and Panama and Venezuela and these Central American Republics are far away, and they are comparatively small; but much of the world's history is going to be written in South and Central America during the next century, and if there is one thing that the United States should do in anticipating the great events and the great developments which will take place in that part of the world, it is to keep its skirts clean of unneutral acts.

The Panama Canal is the great military as well as commercial asset of this country. It should be the great military asset of this country and of no other country; for the instant we begin parceling out military advantages to special favorites, our character among the nations of the earth is lost, and the uses of the canal are prostituted. So I ask Members of the Senate to consider this matter; and can any one tell me that this provision, which gives Colombia an immense advantage against any antagonist with which Colombia may find herself at war, will be liked by the other nations of South America? Are we not bungling once again? We have made too many mistakes, Mr. President, in our relations with these people, and I hope we shall not make another.

Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss just now or at any time, as I said a little while ago, the incidents that occurred in 1903. At that time I was very familiar with them. I learned of them from the lips of a man who bore an important part in them. Having learned all the facts from him, I have been firmly convinced all these years that the Government of the United States bore its part in that incident in an absolutely honest, straightforward, and unassailable manner; and I have seen no evidence submitted since that time, and especially have I seen no evidence submitted in this debate, which would lead me to change my opinion as to what the American Government did, and why it did it, back in 1903.

There can be no excuse whatsoever for the payment of the money unless we have done Colombia a grievous injury. It is futile to talk about assuaging people's feelings when their feelings were self-hurt. That does not carry conviction.

That is not going to satisfy the people who are going to receive the money; much less will it satisfy the American people who are to pay it. This matter was discussed in 1918. It has been discussed again during the last week, and much of the old story has been told again and again, and it is in the Record of the Congress during the last two or three days. The whole story has been recited, and not one item of proof has been adduced that the United States stole anything from Colombia, directly or indirectly.

I have been convinced of this for years, and I am still convinced of it; and feeling as I do about the error that is being made in this treaty with respect to the discriminations in it against every other nation in favor of Colombia, and the inexcusable payment of money to these people who have no right to ask it from us, I can not vote for the treaty. I am not sufficiently nimble-footed to change my position.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I desire to take only a moment or two of the time of the Senate, not with any hope of doing any particular good in the discussion, but in order that I may have in the Record for my constituents to read, at least, my reason for opposing this treaty.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will not the Senator permit me to call for a quorum?

Mr. KENYON. No, no. There is no use of disturbing Senators who are at lunch.

I should think, Mr. President, in view of the questions raised here by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], that Senators would pause and consider well before

they vote for this treaty. I am not, however, going to discuss the matter from that angle.

In the campaign of 1918 I heard many splendid addresses in this country from the leaders of the Republican Party. Nearly every one I heard denounced the Colombian treaty as the crowning infamy in the attempt of Woodrow Wilson to slur the life and character of Theodore Roosevelt. The people of the country were not for the Colombian treaty. They did not believe that Theodore Roosevelt had done a wrong act; and it is most extraordinary and most amazing that three years later, after that issue had helped to win a campaign for the Republicans, Republican leaders have now turned a complete somersault, and what was an infamous crime under Woodrow Wilson becomes a very divine proceeding under the administration of the Republican Party.

In the last campaign I had the pleasure, as other Senators did, of campaigning throughout the country and speaking at various places nearly across the Continent. I do not claim that had anything to do with the result; but I took a good deal of pleasure in pledging my party, as far as I could in my humble way, to economy in government, against the extravagance we had had, that was chargeable undoubtedly to both parties. The people believed in what we said upon the stump about economy, about making a public dollar go as far as a private dollar in the administration of the Government. I believed in it. Yet our very first act as Republicans in power is to vote \$25,000,000 to a set of bandits by a treaty that was denounced in a report filed in this body in 1917, signed by the Republican leaders, as a blackmail proposition!

I do not want to hear much more about economy in this Congress. I have been getting telegrams yesterday and to-day from men representing farming organizations, farmers on the brink of bankruptcy in this country, saying that if we have any money to throw away we might loan it to the farmers of the United States. I have wondered where the voice of the Senator from Utah was, who is always preaching economy and working for it, on the proposition to squander \$25,000,000—not only to squander it, but to pay it out as blackmail.

When the Americanization bill passed the Senate, carrying five or six million dollars a year, it was fought here as an extravagant thing. Senators who now are supporting this measure were against that because it was a waste of public money. It went to the House and was torpedoed there in the interest of economy.

When the maternity bill was here, a bill providing for Federal aid to help in teaching mothers how to raise babies, it was jeered at in the cloakrooms and voted for on the floor, as so many measures are. It carried a million dollars a year. That went to the House and was torpedoed there in the interest of economy.

I wonder what these gentlemen who have raised their voices so loudly about economy are going to say when the soldier bonus bill comes here, and they have the record of voting away \$25,000,000 in a blackmail proposition. What are they going to say to the soldiers of the country who ask compensation? Are you going to talk economy then? Your economy in this Congress has gone. Let us not hear anything more about it.

We have heard a good deal here about people being the friends of Roosevelt. There are different kinds of friends, of course. Nearly everybody now claims to be the friend of Roosevelt. He had millions of friends in life; he has millions of them in death. Why did they not bring this treaty forward during the life of Roosevelt? It would have had no chance in the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. In defense of those friends of Roosevelt; I think the Senator ought to see that they had not changed their minds, and they did not change their minds until after Roosevelt died.

Mr. KENYON. No; they never would have dared in the life of Theodore Roosevelt to place this stigma upon his life; because if we did wrong in Panama, Roosevelt did it. If we stole this land, Roosevelt stole it; if we did steal it, and if it was wrong, we ought to apologize—not only pay the money, which is a halfway apology, a half-baked apology, but apologize like a manly nation. That is the issue.

I do not mean to say, of course, that this ought to be determined on any consideration of Theodore Roosevelt, but I do say that he never appealed to his countrymen to follow a sickly, pusillanimous policy of buying friendship. Bought friendship is not worth a cent on the thousand dollars. Judas Iscariot sold friendship. I think it is as contemptible to buy friendship as it is to sell friendship. If we are going to start in that kind of a proposition, we will not have many friends.

I want to put in the RECORD, not for anybody here, but for the folks at home—for I represent in part a State that believed in Theodore Roosevelt—what he himself said about it. I wish to read a few extracts from his book *Fear God and Take Your Own Part*. He said:

In 1903 a shameless and sordid attempt was made by the then dictator of Colombia and his subordinate fellow politicians at Bogota to force the United States, by scandalously improper tactics, to pay a vastly larger sum for the privilege of building the Panama Canal than had been agreed upon in a solemn treaty. As President of the United States I resisted this attempt, and prevented the United States from being blackmailed.

That is similar to what the minority members of the Foreign Relations Committee said in the minority report in 1903. He—Roosevelt—said further:

Had I not successfully resisted the attempt, the Panama Canal would not now be built and would probably never have been built. The attempt was blackmail then, and to yield to it now is to yield to blackmail.

Is it any different in 1921 on the subject of blackmail from what it was when Roosevelt wrote this book? I continue reading from his book:

Yet the present administration now proposes to pay Colombia \$25,000,000 and to make what is practically an apology for our conduct in acquiring the right to build the canal. Apparently this is done on the theory of soothing the would-be blackmailers and making them forget the mortification caused them by the failure of their initial attempt to hold up the United States.

Then he goes ahead to prove that Panama had the right to do exactly what she did, and Colombia had no claim. We paid \$10,000,000 to Panama and forty million more to the French company, some of which, as the Senator from Wisconsin pointed out last night, went into the coffers of the Colombian Government.

Roosevelt said further:

Let it be remembered that this \$10,000,000 was the price stipulated by Colombia herself as payment to those in possession of the isthmus, and it was the price we actually did pay to those who actually were in possession of the Isthmus. The only difference was that, thanks to the most just and proper revolution which freed Panama from the intolerable oppression and wrongdoing of Colombia, we were able to give this \$10,000,000 to the men who themselves dwelt on the Isthmus instead of to alien taskmasters and oppressors of theirs.

The proposal now is that after having paid \$10,000,000 to the rightful owners of the Isthmus, we shall in addition pay \$25,000,000 to their former taskmasters and oppressors, a sum two and a half times what these tricky oppressors originally asked, a sum which is to be paid to them merely because they failed in carrying to successful completion what must truthfully be characterized as a bit of international villainy as wicked as it was preposterous. In point of good sense and sound morality the proposal is exactly on a par with paying a discomfited burglar a heavy sum for the damage done his feelings by detecting him and expelling him from the house.

I wish this whole chapter might be published in the RECORD.

The Secretary of State, John Hay, who was in the wrongdoing, if any wrongdoing was done, said officially:

The action of the President in the Panama matter is not only in the strictest accordance with the best precedents of our public policy, but it was the only course he could have taken in compliance with our treaty rights and obligations.

Roosevelt further said:

If we pay \$25,000,000 to Colombia now, then there is no reason why we should not at some future time pay her another \$100,000,000; or pay Mexico ten times that sum for having taken Texas and California, Arizona, and New Mexico; or pay a hundred times that sum to Great Britain because our ancestors deprived her of the thirteen colonies.

On page 339, Mr. Bonaparte, the Attorney General at that time, is quoted by President Roosevelt, and I ask that that part of the book be inserted without reading it.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By the treaty we promise to pay Colombia, as a compensation for an alleged injury, a much larger sum of money than we paid France for Louisiana, or Mexico for California, or Spain for the Philippines, or Panama for the Canal Zone, or than Great Britain paid us in settlement of the Alabama claims; if we acknowledge that we have so wronged her as to make it proper for us to buy her forgiveness, it is consistent and appropriate to add to this acknowledgment of wrong an apology, or, in other words, an expression of sorrow; if we have nothing to apologize for, because we have done her no wrong, then it is utterly unworthy of a great Nation and a forfeiture of our right to self-respect for us to pay her a red cent.

Mr. KENYON. Now, Mr. President, if Colombia had demanded such a sum as this, it is entirely probable that the canal would never have been built on that route; it would have gone to some other route. The ten million was the amount which Colombia itself fixed, and which we were then willing to pay.

Under the constitutions of 1858 and 1861, it has been conceded here that Panama reserved the right to secede, to nullify any act inconsistent with its own autonomy.

But the remarkable thing, which I have not been able to understand, not being as wise as some, is the change in the conditions now from what they were when the report of the minority was filed.

I know consistency is the virtue of small minds, and the United States Senate may not be a good place for consistency. But I fail to understand from any of these speeches the difference between the situation in 1921, when we are asked to ratify this treaty, and the situation in 1917, when the Republican minority of the Foreign Relations Committee denounced this as blackmail.

I understand that there are oil concessions in Colombia; that they may be affected by this; that the Government there may go down if the money is not paid; and that the oil concessions may be canceled. Senators have had attorneys of oil interests talk to them about that matter. I am not citing that as a wrongful thing particularly. That may be one of the new things that has gotten into this matter. It may be, in the minds of some, perfectly proper.

In the minority report it is said:

This payment, then, can only be predicated on the assumption that we are indebted to Colombia, either morally or legally, and no combination of words, no niceties of diplomatic language, can hide the naked truth that this treaty is an admission that the conduct of this country in acquiring the right to construct a canal across the Isthmus of Panama was a wrong committed against Colombia. On no other hypothesis could Colombia ask for this indemnity.

Then they speak of the attempt in words to veil this disagreeable aspect. But they say:

There is a clear admission that we are paying this sum to settle a claim for damages. By making the payment we admit the claim.

The minority declare that our conduct in securing an agreement from Panama was just and proper in every respect and that the Colombian Government has no just or equitable claim against this Nation for any act on our part in connection therewith.

If they had no claim then, under the doctrine of the Republican leaders, where do they get the claim now? They say:

This treaty is, in effect, not only a plea of guilty to the charge made against us by Colombia, but an agreement that, in addition to the payment of \$10,000,000, the price for which the Government of Colombia had agreed to convey to us the right of way over the Isthmus, while she claimed sovereign rights over that territory, we shall also pay \$15,000,000 to Colombia as exemplary damages.

What do we pay exemplary damages for in the law? Exemplary damages are not recoverable unless there has been a wanton invasion of right. They are given as "smart" money. They are given as punishment where the tort is committed, with actual malice or deliberate violence or oppression, where the wrong partakes of a criminal character.

So we are told it was \$15,000,000 then—it must be \$15,000,000 now—of exemplary damages, damages by way of punishment to our own country, which are only recoverable in law where the act has been so outrageous that it shocks the consciences of men, and they are given as a punishment for a quasi-criminal act.

We find ourselves in the humiliating spectacle of indorsing the giving of "exemplary damages" against our own country. We had better apologize in a manly way than to submit to exemplary damages. There is no compromise. There is no purchase of good will and good friendship by exemplary damages. Put up the sign, little nations, "Friendship for Sale," and let Uncle Sam be the only buyer.

Now, Mr. President, I know the hours are passing by and it would not be fair for me to take up much of the time of the Senate. The matter has been argued on every hand. I confess to a very deep feeling about it, to the unjust branding of our country as doing such a thing as it is charged with having done. The object of the treaty apparently is to settle a claim which we do not owe for the purpose of buying friendship in order that certain oil concessions may stand.

Roosevelt wrote, as I have called attention here, that it was at that time a shameless and sordid attempt to compel the United States to pay a larger sum for the purpose of building the canal than had been agreed upon in a similar treaty. If it was shameless and sordid in 1903, is it not shameless and sordid in 1921? He wrote that soothing them in 1903 would be blackmail. I am not using that term as my own. He uses it, and if the distinguished leader of the Republican side wrote the minority report, which I do not know, he used it or whoever wrote that report used that nasty word "blackmail." If it was blackmail then, what is it now? If it was acknowledgment of a wrong to pay this money then, what is it now? If it was paying a sum to settle a claim for damages then and admitting the claim, what is it now?

Those signing the report now try to impress upon newly initiated Senators, who view with wonderment the proposition that in following leaders you must turn a complete somersault in three years, and carry them along with the doctrine that something has happened. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] indicated yesterday there was something mysterious, something we were going to get eventually out of

Colombia that we ordinary mortals in the Senate were not entitled to know.

If there had been no international misconduct in the acquisition of this territory, as the committee then said, what has changed their minds about it now? If Colombia had no just or equitable claim, as they said then, when does the equitable claim come now? If it were humiliating and belittling, as was said in that report, to pay exemplary damages in 1917, is it any the less humiliating and belittling to pay exemplary damages in 1921? If the demand in 1917 was blackmail, as they said, why is it any the less blackmail now? If the committee were right in saying in 1917 that once we responded to such a demand we would be held up for every fancied wrong by other countries, why is it any less an invitation now to those countries to proceed on the holdup theory?

What a benevolent Santa Claus old Uncle Sam is anyhow to place this \$25,000,000 in the hands of a lot of grafters who care nothing about this country. I think it was in open session, otherwise I should not refer to it, late at night one time when the distinguished former Senator from Michigan, William Alden Smith, spoke of the treaty and pictured where the money went and how gentlemen were standing outside with their gripsacks just ready to take it to New York for distribution.

Now, I think I shall take no more of the Senate's time. I have felt that the treaty was everything that the committee said about it in 1917 and everything that Roosevelt said about it in his book. I feel now that it is a slight and an insult to his memory, perhaps not intentional, and certain it is that no such treaty as this could pass the Senate if that virile character was still alive. The American people are going to understand it. They are going to wonder about pleas of economy. They will swallow the dose; they will have to, for undoubtedly it is going through. They will do it with an unpleasant countenance, and it will not be any easier for them to swallow it because the bottle may bear the brand, "Taken in oil."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I had not intended to trouble the Senate again with any words of mine, and now I shall be extremely brief. I have one statement that I wish to lay before the Senate. Before I begin on that I wish to state that I listened to the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], as I always do, with great interest and with great respect for his ability. He made a point, which is not a very important one, but which I think worth considering, with reference to giving Colombia the right to transport over the canal troops and munitions of war at all times without paying charges of any kind.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the clause he so strongly condemned occurs in a treaty for which I voted, which was sent to the Senate by President Roosevelt, as follows:

The Government of Colombia shall have the right to transport over the canal its vessels, troops, and munitions of war at all times without paying charges of any kind.

That was in the treaty signed by John Hay and Thomas Herran. In 1909 President Roosevelt sent in a treaty in which, in article 2, it is said:

The Republic of Colombia shall be at liberty at all times to convey through the ship canal now in course of construction by the United States across the Isthmus of Panama ships, materials for war, and ships of war of the Republic of Colombia without paying any duty to the United States, even in the case of an international war between Colombia and another country.

I voted for that treaty. I am unable to see why what was virtuous then should be a crime now. This is a more guarded clause, if possible, than that in either of the two treaties from which I have read.

I desire also to say that in listening to my friend the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], I noted that he continually speaks as if the pending treaty were the same as the treaty of 1917. Of course, the reiteration of a fact is useless at any time, and certainly at this late hour. It is not the treaty of 1917. It is that treaty very much amended, removing one entire article which I thought contained the only apology in it, and think so still, and modifying it in other respects. When one denounces the pending treaty he is denouncing a very different treaty from that of 1917, as reported by Senator Stone to the Senate.

Something has been said also about what Colombia would do with the money. Of course, I can not pretend to say just what Colombians are thinking. We have to take some of their official statements. I have been reminded of a letter which I received in 1919 from Mr. Polk, at that time Counselor for the State Department, containing an extract from a note from Mr. Hoffman Philip, the American minister at Colombia, and quoting the Colombian minister for foreign affairs, who wrote to Mr. Philip as follows:

With reference to the treaty of 1914, pending between Colombia and the United States, I have the honor to inform your excellency that my Government accepts the modifications proposed by your excellency's

Government and communicated in your excellency's note of February 27, 1919, and that it will do everything within the reach and sphere of its power to have them approved in the next Colombian Congress.

I avail myself of this occasion to reiterate what the Colombian Government has already unofficially declared, viz, that the indemnity proceeding from the treaty will be employed in public works and improvements of international benefit and of utility to international commerce, such as port works and transportation facilities. I now add that from the indemnity no sum will be deducted for the payment of commissions or fees for services in connection with the negotiation and ratification of the treaty. Contracts for public improvements will be granted to Colombian citizens and to foreigners in accordance with Colombian laws, and public treaties, there being conceded, naturally, to citizens of the United States the consideration which corresponds to the extraordinary importance of the relations between the two countries.

I merely offer that to show what intention they expressed when they accepted the modifications proposed by the United States. This treaty, I am informed officially, has been agreed to as it stands by the Colombian Government. It has been so presented to the Senate, it being a draft made in the Senate originally.

Mr. President, I am not going over the old ground which has been gone over so fully in arguments on both sides. I regret that so much bitterness should have been imported into the debate. It seems to me that it is possible to differ as to the advisability of the treaty without impugning motives which only Omniscience can know.

It has seemed to me—it seemed to me in 1919—that it would be an advantage to the United States to secure the recognition by Colombia of Panama and her boundaries. That has been attempted by four administrations. It was attempted by the Root-Cortés treaty in 1909, when \$2,500,000 was offered for that recognition; by the Taft administration later, when \$10,000,000 was offered for the recognition of the boundaries and the independence of Panama; then by the Wilson administration, when \$25,000,000 was offered; and now the same offer is proposed for the same chief purpose by the present administration. In other words, it was the desire of all those administrations, and they believed it for the interest of the United States, to close that outstanding difference with Colombia. I do not think we can take the position that because we have had a quarrel—not a war—with any country we can never therefore come into any relations with her.

The ratification of the pending treaty is asked for by the President as part of a great major policy which he believes will be of very large value and importance to the people of the United States and for the benefit of the entire American hemisphere. It has seemed to me that that policy on his part was correct.

I think there is room for difference of opinion as to whether this treaty constitutes a humiliation or a reflection on Theodore Roosevelt or a reflection on the United States. That is a matter of opinion. There are those who think so and there are those who do not think so. Those who do not think so are just as patriotic and just as devoted to their country as are those who do think so. No man has a right to lay down his own rule for the determination of the patriotism of others and to condemn them if there is an honest difference of opinion. I have served in the Senate for 28 years and for 6 years in the House of Representatives. I have never before been accused of not loving my country and not desiring to serve it. In my humble way I have tried to do so, and I think I have been as jealous of her rights and honor as any man could be. I should never for a moment think of doing anything that I thought could be in any way distorted into a reflection on the honor of the United States. I do not think, I can not think honestly that there is any such reflection now possible.

I may easily be mistaken; we all may be mistaken and are liable to mistake, but I believe that it is for the advantage of my country to ratify this treaty and—perhaps at the cost of a very large sum, if you please—try to cure and heal an open sore which exists in the relations between this country and the country which adjoins the Panama Canal. I think it is for the interest of our security, of our defense, of the safety of the canal, which is a very insecure possession from a military point of view. I believe it will be helpful not merely to business but to the best interests of the United States and of the whole American hemisphere, in which we have not only a great interest but a certain degree of protection to give. It is for that reason that I support the President in his policy, of which this is the initial step.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I quite agree, in part, with the suggestions just made by the able leader of the majority, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I do not intend to depart from the rule which he lays down that this is not the place to question men's motives. In my brief experience here I have seldom, if ever, indulged in the practice of questioning the motives of my colleagues. That leaves me all the more

free to question their logic; and it is with that I have to do at this particular time rather than the question of motive.

The Senator from Massachusetts has advised us that this is a part of a great policy upon the part of the President, and that he is disposed to support the measure because it is a part of a great policy. Possibly, if that policy were unfolded and I could find any particular place in the policy where the admission by the United States of wrongdoing, of which it is innocent, would have anything to do with advancing the policy, I might be so convinced of the worth of the policy that I would be willing to make that admission. But it is a fearful admission to make, and before I make it I must be convinced of the great worth of the policy for which I exchange the honor of my country. I recall when we were once before dealing with the question of the Panama Canal in reference to the question of freedom from tolls that we were also advised at that time that the President would not know how to deal with matters of immediate concern unless the canal were thrown open to all the nations of the earth upon equal terms with our own.

I am bound to assume that the President had in mind at that time a policy something similar perhaps to the policy which is now, in a nebulous way, suggested to us by the Senator from Massachusetts. Some eight years have passed since we repealed the tolls provision of the Panama Canal act, and we have yet to learn what the policy was which was immediately concerned with the question of repeal. I suggest, therefore, Mr. President, that in justice to the Senate and in justice to those who sincerely believe that this treaty is an injustice to our country and to its taxpayers, we can not be criticized if we fail to follow when the way has not yet been pointed out nor the program revealed. To follow blindly is a very difficult habit for a man of self-respect to acquire. I shall be exceedingly pleased to follow any program which our President has with reference to Central America and South America if I find it to be in the interest of this country, but I can not follow until I am advised what it is. I am particularly favorable to some of the statements which he made in the city of New York on yesterday as to our policy with reference to the people to the south; but I have yet to hear any argument which advances a reason why the United States in the initiatory step of that policy should make confession of a crime of which it is not guilty. Furthermore, Mr. President, I assume that the President does not expect us to follow where our conscience and our reason do not take us.

Mr. President, a few days ago the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] addressed the Senate upon this question and announced the policy upon which he sought, with great ability, to justify his vote for this treaty. I regret that he is absent, but I desire, nevertheless, to ask the Senate for a short time to consider the remarks made by the Senator, and especially circumstances and facts omitted by him, which it seems to me ought to be taken into consideration in connection with the facts which he stated in his speech, and the rule of adjustment which he promulgated.

He proceeds in the first instance to show conclusively that the United States Government was wholly innocent of any wrongdoing touching the secession of Panama. He was at the time, if I remember correctly, a member of the administration which was then in power, its legal adviser, and entirely familiar with all the facts and circumstances relating to the secession of Panama. He recounts the history, calls our attention to the documents, construes them in his able manner, and must have convinced all who listened to him that the United States was wholly innocent of any wrongdoing. After having concluded himself upon the proposition that our own Government was innocent, he announced the principle upon which he felt himself justified in supporting the treaty. He said:

Our entire course from the beginning to the end of the whole transaction squared to our rights and duties and to the governing rules and principles of international law.

As a matter of law therefore we are and have been under no obligation whatsoever to make amends to Colombia for the action which we took. If through her own acts she deprived herself of something which she would have obtained had her course been different, the resulting loss must as a matter of law lie where it falls.

If Colombia has been guilty of an act which has resulted in injury to herself, says the Senator, and if she has received injury it is by reason of her own act, and the damage must be permitted to lie where it fell. A fairly sound proposition and pretty well embedded in all the systems of jurisprudence with which I am familiar. But he further said:

But for reasons of state and looking to all the circumstances of the case it would appear that the people of the United States ought not to permit the loss to lie where it fell, and that on the contrary we ought to make to the Colombian Government and people some suitable compensation for the self-inflicted loss which they sustained, at least to the extent that we were direct gainers by that loss.

We ought to understand that one who was a part of the administration, its legal adviser, entirely familiar with the whole transaction, has wholly exonerated us, and, secondly, that the only basis upon which we can ratify the treaty is that of compensating Colombia for her self-inflicted loss, a proposition which involves some hazard. When we consider that we are dealing with Central and South American countries and bear in mind their capacity to inflict injury upon themselves, I can see no limit to it.

It was said by some gentleman during the recent campaign that our Secretary of the Treasury during the war would go out upon the street and meet a man who spoke a foreign tongue, give him a check upon the Treasury of the United States, and tell him to go over to Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, and organize a republic and come back and get another check. The Republicans, after having made a campaign for economy, announce a principle which is infinitely worse, to wit, our willingness to compensate the South and Central American Republics for any loss which they may inflict upon themselves, provided some possible argument to be adduced should show any resulting benefit, without our connivance, to ourselves. This will require a rare system of bookkeeping, and a vigilance in which we will not dare to nod, much less to sleep.

The taxpayers of the country, who expected relief through a change of administration, will scarcely spell any of it out of that situation.

But the Senator says, "To the extent, at least, to which we have gained by that loss."

Very well; let us see. The Senator puts the two parties in a court of equity—not in a court of law, but in a court of equity. They are to equalize their losses and compensations with the purpose of arriving at the ethics of the situation.

The first thing which will suggest itself to all lawyers is, How does Colombia get into a court of equity at all under the Senator's rule and the facts he presents? A man can not go into a court of equity except with clean hands. When he is in the wrong, when he has inflicted a loss upon himself, and especially when the self-inflicted loss results from an evil motive, no system of jurisprudence, no theory of government, no policy of international law would ever admit him into a court of equity or a court which might be called, figuratively speaking, a court of equity. But in some way or other the Senator pulls them into his court of equity, and I am pleased they are there. It gives us an opportunity to review again just precisely the situation with reference to these parties in a court of equity. Having got them into a court by rules known to no court of equity, we must examine the equities.

Let us go back just a moment, therefore, to the treaty of 1846.

Under the treaty of 1846 between Colombia or New Granada and the United States, New Granada or Colombia dedicated this right of way to canal purposes. Extremely anxious to have the canal constructed, unable to construct it themselves, they initiated the negotiations by which they asked the United States to take upon herself the burden of protecting the neutrality of the zone and the moral obligation to build a canal.

In a court of equity, never after the signing of the treaty of 1846 had Colombia the right to ask for a single dollar for that right of way. So when Colombia came here in 1901 and 1902 and again initiated negotiations for the purpose of closing a treaty John Hay and the then administration, of which the Senator from Pennsylvania was a part, advised Colombia that under the treaty of 1846 they were not in a position to ask for a single dollar in the way of compensation; that if the United States would take the responsibility of constructing the canal, a matter of such stupendous advantage to Colombia, in view of the dedication which was made in the treaty of 1846, they had no right to ask for the \$7,000,000 which they did ask for at that time, now raised to \$25,000,000. Objection was made at that time to any compensation at all; but finally, according to John Hay, by reason of the fact that Colombia insisted upon it, and being interested in the proposition of satisfying her to the full, they yielded to the demand for \$7,000,000. In other words, Colombia violated the rules of equity and fair dealing in the very inception by demanding money for that which she had dedicated to canal purposes.

What has happened since then? Who has profited by the building of the Panama Canal more than Colombia? Bear in mind we are in a court of equity. In 1904 ex-Senator Root, then a member of the administration and Secretary of War, if I remember correctly, made a speech before the Union League Club in Chicago in which he also dealt with the equities of the situation or the ethics of the Panama Canal transaction. Strangely enough, both of these great lawyers entitled their speeches "The equities of the transaction" or "The ethics of the transaction." In that speech, Senator Root surveyed the

entire ground, massed the evidence, gathered the records, weighed the equities, and pronounced it as his judgment that instead of Colombia being damaged by the building of the canal no nation upon the face of the earth had benefited by the canal so much as Colombia.

Let me quote two paragraphs from the ex-Senator's speech:

Colombia stood to profit more by the building of that canal than any other nation upon earth. Her territory stretching across the northwestern end of South America was without internal communication or unity. Her principal towns upon her Atlantic and her Pacific coasts were separated by ranges of lofty mountains not traversed by any railroad, and for the most part without roads of any kind. The building of a canal would, for the first time, establish practical and easy communication between her different Provinces. The work of construction would bring enormous sums to be expended in her territory, and the operation of the canal would set Colombia upon a great highway of the world's commerce with incalculable opportunities for development and wealth. She had acknowledged the world's right to the canal. She had specifically granted the right of way to the United States. She had induced the United States to assume the moral obligation for its construction by excluding all other nations from the Isthmus for her protection. When she came to settle the terms of this "supplementary convention," the detailed arrangements under which this enormous benefit might be conferred upon mankind, and especially upon herself, she demanded to be paid.

Reluctantly, and with a sense that it was an unjust exaction, the United States agreed to pay \$10,000,000 down and \$250,000 per annum in perpetuity—substantially the entire amount exacted by Colombia. We were not going into the enterprise to make money, but for the common good. We did not expect the revenues of the canal to repay its cost, or to receive any benefit from it, except that which Colombia would share to a higher degree than ourselves. Against the hundreds of millions which we were obligating ourselves to expend, Colombia was expected only to permit the use of a small tract of otherwise worthless land already, in substance, devoted to that purpose. We were not seeking a privilege which Colombia was entitled to withhold but settling the method in which the acknowledged right of mankind over a portion of her soil should be exercised, with due regard to her special interests. It was not just that we should pay anything, but it was better to pay than to coerce a weaker nation.

What was the situation when we started to build this canal? Colombia, as ex-Senator Root said, lay upon two oceans, with her territory disconnected, with no means of transportation between the different parts of her country, and herself wholly unable to build the canal. We expended \$400,000,000, in round figures, to construct it. We are under obligations to maintain it for all time. Colombia expends not a dollar, and yet it is of more benefit to her than to any other nation in the world. Where do the equities in this court of equity lie?

Not only that, Mr. President; as has been said here by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON], and also the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], we went further and cleaned up a pesthole in the very front yard of Colombia, a condition with which she was unable to deal, which she had not the means to take care of. We spent millions of dollars for the purpose of making it a safe place into which human beings could go, and to relieve her from the constant and everlasting threat and menace of disease in her own territory. Disease lurked under every leaf of that swamp, and death rode the wind of the entire Canal Zone, and the people of the United States expended their money and their means that people might dwell there in health, and thus Colombia greatly benefited. Now, I ask you, my friends, if you were a Colombian, and were going to estimate the value of that to you, how would you estimate it? How can you estimate the value of that which would save the lives of thousands of your people? It is not subject to be estimated in dollars and cents. It was of incalculable value to the people of Colombia. Not only did we clean it up, but we are obligated to keep it so for all time. Colombia is indebted to us beyond any sum she could ever pay for this work, this practical skill which cost her not a dollar.

If you are going to measure the equities in this case, where are the equities? If you are going to adopt the theory of compensating others for injury to the extent to which we have gained, must you not also estimate the extent to which the other party has gained?

So, Mr. President, if you will weigh the equities upon this side and upon that you will find that the equities of this transaction are upon the side of the United States, and that Colombia is indebted to the United States in hundreds of millions of dollars.

But furthermore, Mr. President, the able Senator from Pennsylvania says that the Hay-Herran treaty was an unworkable treaty, and that it was to the interest of the United States to have a workable treaty, so that we could build a canal and have there this great transportation system. Well, who was more interested in having a workable treaty than Colombia? The Senator from Pennsylvania weighs all upon the side of the United States that weighs against us, and weighs nothing that weighs in our favor, in order to construct a theory which enables him, in this exigency in which we find ourselves, to find a reason for voting for this treaty.

If it was an unworkable treaty for us, it was an unworkable treaty for Colombia; and if we could not construct a canal

under it, Colombia could not be benefited by the canal. So it was just as much to the interest of Colombia to have the Hay-Herran treaty reconstructed as it was to the interest of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I trust, I sincerely trust, that the statute of limitations will be permitted to run against this class of claims. I sincerely trust the rule laid down will be regarded for Colombia and this dire exigency alone. When we secured Texas it was charged that we connived at the revolution which brought about the secession of Texas from Mexico. Foreign writers and historians still so assert.

If you go down into Mexico you will find in the schools of Mexico that the Mexicans still teach their children that we connived at the revolution which separated Texas from Mexico, and that the time will come when Mexico will be strong enough and powerful enough to regain the territory which was unjustly taken from her. Reflect for a moment what we gained by the secession of Texas. It is a perfect case within the rule.

But there is a case closer home, Mr. President. In 1911 we went into Nicaragua. We landed some several hundred troops in Nicaragua. We shot and killed some 200 Nicaraguans. We marched clear across their country from the bay to the capital. We took possession of their capital. We installed as President against the wishes of 80 per cent of the people of Nicaragua an agent of corporations in the United States, and then we surrounded the White House at Managua with marines, who are still there, who have been there from 1911 to 1921; and the present Government of Nicaragua would not exist for a fortnight if it were not for the fact that our armed forces surround the White House in Nicaragua and maintain the Government.

What did we do during that time? We made a treaty with Nicaragua, arranged to pay her a certain sum of money which her people insisted was too small but which we insisted was enough, and closed a treaty of a great deal of importance to Nicaragua, which the people of Nicaragua propose, so we are informed, if they are ever given back their Government, to repudiate; and when we closed that treaty, as the able Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] very well said, we were both ends of the treaty-making power. The man who sat in the White House at Managua was nothing but the agent of the United States, who had been placed there by armed force and held there by force.

Infinitely better than this transaction for a large sum of damages is the transaction in Nicaragua.

What will we do with reference to Santo Domingo? We know that when Secretary Colby visited the South American countries upon his last trip a delegation of San Dominicans traveled throughout that country ahead of him, and wherever they went they asked in advance of his coming, "What do you propose to do with reference to Santo Domingo? You having occupied our territory and destroyed our sovereignty and shot and killed our people. You profess friendship for the people to the south. What do you propose to do with reference to Santo Domingo?"

If we ever adopt the rule laid down by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], the taxpayers of the United States will have cause to repent the hour that we do so.

Mr. President, there is only one rule to adopt with reference to South American countries, large or small, and that is the rule of justice; that is the rule of square dealing. If the supporters of the Colombian treaty were able to disclose that the United States had in fact wronged Colombia, that we had taken that which was hers without compensation, it would undoubtedly be our solemn duty to pay for it and to accompany it with an apology. But if you lay down the doctrine that you propose to compensate for demands made, when you stand before your people and say that the demands result from the wrongful action of those making them, there is no end to our trouble in the Central and South American countries.

But the singular and startling feature of the rule of liability and settlement, with which our future is imperiled, is yet to be stated. The Senator from Pennsylvania further declares in his speech:

No man can read fairly the record of our course during those literally fateful October days of 1903 and escape the conviction that at any rate we were not illy disposed toward revolution.

One would naturally surmise that we were about to have fastened upon us some evil deed following these evil thoughts. But not so. Our evil is confined to our evil thoughts. For the Senator immediately follows in his speech with this statement:

There is no intention of even hinting at a suggestion that the United States took a collusive part in fomenting or inciting the uprising upon the Isthmus of Panama * * * and charges to that effect are calumnious.

So, sir, the beginning of our responsibility now, and in the future, under this rule of settlement, is the merely not thinking illy of the revolution. We have heard much about being neu-

tral in thought as well as act in these late years, and many have ridiculed and many have criticized it. But if the principles announced by the Senator from Pennsylvania are to have their place in future jurisprudence or international law no President was ever wiser or more patriotic than the President who warned us to be neutral in thought as well as in act. For being unneutral in thought is henceforth to be the beginning of responsibility for whatever follows. Think of what we are now loading upon the taxpayers of this country because we did not think illy of the Panama revolution. We did not have a part in it, and we did not even connive at it, and to say so is slander. But we did not think illy of it. And thus began our winters of discontent.

Mr. President, what a slave we make of the human intellect that it may drag us out of the moral mire into which we so often plunge. I doubt if the taxpayers of this country, worried and burdened almost to the point of distraction, will appreciate this new system, this new standard of responsibility. It may be that it will serve all right as a luxury or to afford an escape from a dire exigency, but certainly it would not be desirable for daily consumption.

Now, just a word with reference to what we are giving Colombia in addition to all we have done for her. I do not dare to discuss at length the \$25,000,000, because in these times you can hardly get your consent to reflect upon \$25,000,000. We are doing business now in billions, and it is more or less a manifestation of local prejudice and provincial narrowness for a man to discuss the impropriety of appropriating \$25,000,000 for anything. He can never hope to acquire the reputation of a statesman by discussing such petty things. Therefore, rather than to forfeit my standing before the Senate and my colleagues, I am not going to dwell at length upon the question of paying \$25,000,000.

But it is well worth while remembering, as we pass, that at the last session of Congress we had to curtail our appropriations to take care of the wounded boys who had come back from the war broken in body and shattered in mind because it was said we did not have money enough to provide for their proper care. One of the arguments made against a bonus is we can not afford it.

It is well to bear in mind that the people who were asking us to appropriate for the building of public roads were advised that we did not have the money with which to build them; and the people who petition us to-day to relieve them from taxes, from the stupendous burdens under which they are bending, are advised by our financial leaders in the Senate and in the executive department that it will be impossible to do so, as there is no place where we can cut. Those things perhaps are permissible to be considered even when we are appropriating only \$25,000,000.

But that is not the worst feature of this treaty. The worst feature of the treaty are these special privileges which will be granted, and I do not care how often they have been written in previous treaties. That is no answer at all. The point is they are here now, and it is our business, under our oaths, to deal with them now, and not invoke precedents of the past, which may have been as erroneous, and founded on just as erroneous reasons, as the one which we are about to establish.

We propose to give Colombia the right to transfer her ships of war, and her munitions, over our territory—not in time of peace but in all times, and that means in time of war. Suppose the other South American countries come to you next week and say, "Do you propose to discriminate against the other South American countries?" What are you going to say? What answer are you going to make to them? They will cite the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and you will be under a treaty obligation to treat them the same as you treat Colombia. They will refer to the favored-nation clause, and you will be under the obligation to treat them the same.

The able Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Fall, made a speech here on the 7th of June, 1918, and dealt with this question, and no man understands the South American situation better than Secretary Fall. He stated then that this provision in this treaty instead of making for peace would make trouble throughout Central America and South America, because we would either have to grant the rights to all the nations or else be charged with discriminating in favor of Colombia. The other three provisions are likewise discriminatory in favor of Colombia.

The other special provisions are equally obnoxious, equally discriminatory. My limit of time forbids my going into them, but they are all of the same nature, the same import. These special rights and privileges are unjust, unwise, and will come back to plague us.

Mr. President, what all have we done? We have taxed our people \$400,000,000 to build a canal of more advantage to

Colombia than any other nation in the world. We have cleaned up a pesthole which had been a threat to the health of her entire people, and we have agreed to maintain that for all time. If an earthquake comes and destroys it, we must renew it. The burden is upon us. Do you not think the equities of this situation have been pretty thoroughly met?

It seems to me, Mr. President, that even according to the doctrine laid down by the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox], we have nothing upon which we can fairly ask our own people and our taxpayers to respond to this demand. Innocent, says the Senator, of all wrongdoing, nevertheless after the great advantages Colombia derives from the canal, we must give her special rights and ask the taxpayers to pay her \$25,000,000.

Mr. President, notwithstanding it has been referred to, I do not want to close this debate without referring to another matter ever present in this discussion and always to be considered.

It constitutes another and a final reason—to me a commanding reason—why I must vote against this treaty. I can not upon any facts revealed by this record or any arguments adduced record my vote where it will stand for all time as a solemn impeachment of the veracity, the right conduct, and the honor of two very great Americans. One of them I never knew, except as every American knows him—reared in the school of Lincoln, never recreant in all his public service to the high principles of his early training, and whose dispatches under two Presidents did honor to the office which Jefferson and Webster and Seward once graced. The other, whose friendship I enjoyed, but by no means so intimately as some who sit about me, was for 40 years the relentless adversary of wrongdoing in public place, twice our President, and always after entering public service a leader. The lives, characters, and public services of these men are now the common treasure, the common heritage, and should be the common pride of us all. I can not, upon these facts, help to write down in the archives of our Government a judgment that both were false and each without truth, both devoid of the first essential of an American gentleman. This treaty, this payment, can not be just to the American people unless these two men were men without truth and without honor. We have no right to take this vast sum of money from the taxpayers of this country and turn it over to the agents of Colombia, except upon the ground that these men not only acted iniquitously but lied incontinently. There is no escape from this conclusion.

If we ratify this treaty, we write theft in black letters across the entire record, which shall in future years recount to American youth the story of this brilliant achievement, and we inscribe above the names of Roosevelt and Hay the ugly terms—false, mendacious, unreliable. There can be no other inference drawn by the historian, and there will be no other judgment rendered by the world at large.

The incessant debate throughout these long years has been over the questions of the usurpation of power, of the alleged moral obliquity, of the truthfulness or untruthfulness of these men. The very basis, the sole foundation of the claim, in the beginning and now, rest upon these charges. If the charges be false, we owe Colombia nothing. The charges not only include wrong to Colombia, but they go to the extent of declaring, because of the acts and the unvarnished words of these men, we violated international law and forfeited before the world our national honor. Hay and Roosevelt forfeited our national honor! They accentuated it and added to its splendor! What is the treaty about, if not about these things, and these alone? Why do we grant these special privileges in the canal? What are these millions being paid for if the then President acted honorably and spoke truthfully, and if the then Secretary of State did not, by his acts and words, belie every precept and abandon every principle inculcated in that school of those old heroic days? Why are we called upon to treat with these people at all? If this payment is not for reparation for a wrong done, then it is a holdup. If this is not a payment for a wrongful and indefensible injury, then it is blackmail. What the treaty in fact does is to insult the memory of Theodore Roosevelt and John Hay and to unjustly take from the American people the money they do not owe. To ratify this treaty is to admit the truth of the charges, and they are not true.

You may wind and turn and differentiate as you will, but this haunting, accusing fact meets you at every double, to wit, that this \$25,000,000 is a fine imposed after a plea of guilty. Let us put it plainly, and put it to ourselves. Suppose it was your individual conduct which was under fire. Suppose it was by reason of your dereliction in public service, your hazard of your country's honor, that the people were asked to tax themselves and pay this large sum of money. Suppose, feeling you were unjustly assailed, you had asserted over and over again that you had done no unseemly thing, were guilty of no unrighteous act, and that our people should not be mulcted because

of your supposed lawlessness. Would you feel you had been vindicated if, notwithstanding some language of the treaty had been changed, nevertheless the Senate, passing upon the matter, declared the money should be paid? Would you not feel, would you not know, that the payment of the money was of itself your denunciation, your condemnation, your disgrace? Take it home to yourself, and what comfort, what consolation, would you get out of this treaty? And feeling, as I know you would, how do you think, knowing him as you did, the sensitive, fighting soul of Roosevelt would feel? He looked upon the building of this canal, in many respects, as the greatest achievement of his career—a monument reared to himself which would not crumble, but rather augment in greatness and glory with the flight of time. Shall we now, that he is dead, unable to speak for himself, be less jealous, less determined, in defending the integrity of his great deed than was he while alive?

Bear in mind this is not the condemnation of a policy, differing with some former great leader as to the wisdom or unwisdom of party action. Upon such things it is not only permissible but it is the duty of Senators and all men to record their views, regardless of differences. No man, living or dead, has any right divine to govern either the minds or consciences of his fellows on questions of policy or of statecraft. I quickly concede that every policy, every question, every party action must, in the interest of the whole people, be tested by the test of inherent worth and not by individual indorsement or mere party stamp. But that is not what we are doing here. We approve the policy. We point with pride to that great monument there in the southern seas. We boast of the fruits of these endeavors. We are fond of recounting how this enterprise had languished, how it had baffled the genius and dissipated the fortunes of others, and how, at last, it came to a superb realization under the bold leadership and resourceful talents of a great American. Our country claims it all as the crowning achievement of the daring nineteenth century. But, rejoicing over the achievement, we condemn the veracity, the sense of justice, the conception of honor of the men to whose masterly talents we owe it all. We join in great pride in claiming the gathering of the burglar, but we seem to think we save our reputation by denouncing the way the burglar used the "jimmy." What a strange and unholy mixture of impudence and insincerity such a record will reveal. As Mr. Roosevelt said in regard to this particular treaty—

if we are justified in paying the \$25,000,000, it is proof positive that in opening up the canal we are engaged in the dedication of stolen goods.

It has been said, and if I remember correctly, by a gifted son of Massachusetts, "It is a grave thing when a State puts a name among her jewels." So it is. Grave, because a State is judged by the men whom it places among its idols. Grave, because once there and placed there through the affections and esteem of a people, they are part of the State's wealth, a part of that for which the State is organized, and for which it lives, and without which it can not endure. Embedded in its traditions, interwoven in its every fiber, the justification of its being, the prophecy of its future, the promise of its perpetuity, the character and achievements, the good names and the honor of a nation's great, are certainly equally to be defended with its material wealth or its dominions. If some sleazy island, inhabited by wandering mongrels, or not inhabited at all, over which the flag had been raised, were assailed, we would sound a call to arms, and, if need be, blood would flow and men would die. If the slanderer, the venal lobbyist, the foreign traducer, invades our Capital and on our very streets and in our public places seek to sanctify their sordid appetites by basely libeling our honored dead, speaking for myself, I treat them, too, as our Nation's enemies, and deal with them as such. If Colombia has business to transact with the United States, or if our citizens have legitimate interests there which should be protected by treaty, we can afford to be both gracious and generous. But when she comes seeking to encompass the dishonor and the degradation of our own, the impeachment of an American President, and the discrediting of a great Secretary of State, so far as my voice and vote have sway and effect, I reject the whole proposition. I reject it in full. I will not act upon this base and groundless slander. Yes; it is a grave thing when a State places a name among her jewels, but is a more serious thing, a wicked and reckless hour, when we shall conclude there is no duty devolving upon us here to shelter against unjust and unconscionable assaultment those to whom our country owes an everlasting debt of gratitude.

There are occasions, Mr. President, which seem to summon men of a superior order for some great enterprise. Cautious men, men of limited vision and timid souls would falter and the enterprise would die. How well our own history reveals

this. The old confederacy is crumbling, Washington sounds the call for a conference, and a Republic is born. Napoleon is in distress, Jefferson tramples upon provincial prejudice, flies in the face of almost universal objection, Louisiana is purchased, and that Republic is given dominion over a continent. Civil War rends our people, doubt is upon every hand, the clouds of adversity lower upon the Nation, Lincoln invokes the benediction of a just God by giving liberty to a race, and that Republic emerges purged, disenthralled, and reunited. A great enterprise languishes, seems to circumvent human skill and thwart human energy. Roosevelt grapples with it, conquers obstacles which seemed insuperable, and that Republic becomes the master of two oceans and secure in its dominancy of a continent. What a pathetic story this Western Continent would tell; what a tragedy this effort to build here a new nation would have been had it not been for these men of daring, men of action, men of faith. Mr. President, I have no doubt of the integrity of all acts in connection with this great enterprise and the honor of all our deeds touching the secession of Panama; but if I had a doubt, I confess to you, I would resolve that doubt in favor of the men who dedicated their lives and gave the full devotion of their great hearts to the upbuilding and strengthening and honoring of the Republic they loved.

Mr. STERLING obtained the floor.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I offer one amendment, which I think under the rules should be read. May I say that the amendment is simply for the purpose of preventing the United States from doing a potentially unneutral act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In line 1, section 1, of article 1, strike out the words "at all times" and insert the words "except during war between Colombia and another country with which the United States is at peace," so it will read:

The Republic of Colombia shall be at liberty, except during war between Colombia and another country with which the United States is at peace, to transport through the interoceanic canal its troops, materials of war, and ships of war, without paying any charges to the United States.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think perhaps I should state briefly my reason for supporting the Colombian treaty and why I can not agree with the position so eloquently and forcefully maintained by those who are opposed to it. I am not much concerned with the alleged inconsistencies of some who now urge the ratification of the treaty. Whatever statements to the contrary they may have made in the past, we must at least give them credit for some moral courage when, in anticipation of being confronted with the record of previous reports and speeches, they now stand for a treaty which at one time they criticized or condemned.

The future historian, looking back on the events which have at last led up to the consideration of this treaty by the United States Senate, will take little note of the criminations and recriminations which have arisen out of the diplomatic efforts of this Government to secure the right to construct a canal across the Isthmus of Panama. That record will recite little more than that in January, 1903, a treaty was negotiated under authority of an act of Congress, between the representative of the United States on the one hand and of Colombia on the other hand; that the treaty was rejected by the Colombian Senate; that immediately following there was a bloodless revolution in Panama and the establishment of a Panamanian Republic; that there was prompt recognition of that Republic by our Government, and then a treaty which gave the United States more and better defined rights for the purposes of the construction and operation of a canal across the Isthmus than had been given by the terms of the proposed treaty with Colombia in the same year, the money consideration for whatever rights and concessions were granted to be the same in the latter as had been proposed in the earlier treaty with Colombia.

Of course, the historian will recognize the powerful and dominating influence behind these efforts. To Theodore Roosevelt and the Roosevelt administration he will rightfully give the credit for the successful accomplishment of the great enterprise for which the civilized world had been eagerly waiting. In another age, under another school of diplomacy, in order to gain an end half so great and beneficent as the Panama Canal, all the devious methods with which the Roosevelt administration has ever been charged would have escaped criticism. The end would have justified the means. The desire to treat with Colombia could have been pretended while secret influences were at work to breed discontent and opposition to the treaty on the part of the Colombian people, know-

ing that such opposition would lead to rejection, and that rejection would be followed by the revolution in Panama, for which preparation had already been made.

But these were not the days nor this the country of a Talleyrand or a Metternich. It was the best period of American diplomacy. John Hay was Secretary of State. It was but a short time before the negotiation of the Hay-Herran treaty, when, in speaking of the triumphs of American diplomacy, he said:

I think I may say that our sister Republics to the south of us are perfectly convinced of the sincerity of our attitude. They know we desire the prosperity of each of them and peace and harmony among them. We no more want their territory than we covet the mountains of the moon.

Having spoken of our insular possessions as destined to "indefinite development," he said:

Next in order will come a Pacific cable and an Isthmian Canal for the use of all well-disposed peoples, but under exclusive American ownership and American control, of both which great enterprises President McKinley and President Roosevelt have been the energetic and consistent champions.

In that same address he epitomized our foreign policy in these words:

The briefest expression of our rule of conduct is perhaps the Monroe doctrine and the golden rule. With this simple chart we can hardly go far wrong.

With such a creed and such expression of interest in the welfare of the South American Republics on the part of our great Secretary, I must conclude that all that he attempted or achieved in either the Colombian or Panamanian treaty was in good faith, without diplomatic pretense and without any violation of the "golden rule." And likewise, I acquit his chief of wrong or connivance at any wrong on the part of any official or citizen of the United States, at any stage of the events, from the negotiation of the Hay-Herran treaty until the exchange of ratification with Panama finally sealed our right to begin and carry on to conclusion the splendid enterprise.

There is no proof of duplicity or of international wrongdoing of any kind. This Government was within its rights in urging ratification of the Hay-Herran treaty by the Colombian Senate; within its rights under the circumstances in giving that Government to understand that the "friendly understanding" between this country and Colombia depended on ratification by the Colombian Senate. It was within its rights in sending troops to protect free transit across the Isthmus; within its rights in not intervening to suppress the revolution of November 3 in Panama; in later recognizing the Republic of Panama, and then making the Hay-Bunau Varilla treaty granting the right of this Government to construct the canal, with all the other rights specified in the treaty.

Mr. President, I believe Colombia presents a case for tolerance rather than denial or defiance. It is not a Great Britain with her power and prestige with whom we treat, nor a France, conspicuous for her patriotism and endurance in war, nor an Italy, or even a Germany. Neither are we considering a treaty with either a Brazil or an Argentine. But the case is that of Colombia. She is without power or prestige. She is without fame for any long-continued or united loyalty on the part of her people toward any Government, and I think that up to the time of the defeat of the Maroquin régime she had been without capacity to maintain a real Republic. While she has great natural resources, they are largely undeveloped. Her population is barely 5,000,000, of which 10 per cent only are whites, 15 per cent Indian, 40 per cent mestizos—white and Indian, and 35 per cent Negroes, with their mixtures of the other two races. It is said of the whites that they are chiefly composed of the descendants of the Spanish colonists. They live for the most part in the highlands of the interior.

The isolation of these distant inland settlements has served to preserve the language, manners, and physical characteristics of these early colonists with less variation than in any other Spanish-American State. They form an intelligent, high-spirited class of people, with all the defects and virtues of their ancestry. Their isolation has made them ignorant to some extent of the world's progress, while a super-sensitive patriotism blinds them to the discredit and disorganization which political strife and misrule have brought upon them.

Ninety per cent of the population of Colombia are illiterate, due to the long period of political disorder and the indifference of the ruling class to the welfare of the common people.

I confess that as against such a people I can entertain no feelings of rancor or resentment for their attitude toward the Hay-Herran treaty. "They stand in their own light," is an expression often applied to individuals and peoples more advanced than they.

That the people, so far as they were capable of expressing themselves through the elections of members of the Colombian Congress and through the press, were opposed to the treaty is, I think, manifest from the correspondence between Mr. Beaupre,

our minister to Colombia at the time, and Mr. Hay. I beg to call attention to a part of that correspondence. I can not, of course, take the time to read it all. On April 15 Mr. Beaupre writes Mr. Hay from the legation at Bogota as follows:

SIR: I have the honor to advise you that within the last month there has been such a sudden outburst of controversy, both in the Bogota press and among the public in this city, with regard to the Panama Canal convention that I feel it my duty to report on what I regard as the chances for and against its passing Congress.

After narrating certain events he further says:

Since then a complete revolution in feeling has taken place. From approbation to suspicion and from suspicion to decided opposition have been the phases of change in public sentiment during the last month. The newspapers of the city are full of strongly worded articles denouncing the convention, and in general these articles show the most bitter hostility to a scheme which they represent as being the attempt of a strong nation to take an unfair advantage of the crisis through which Colombia is passing, and for a paltry sum rob her of one of the most valuable sources of wealth which the world contains.

I call attention to another passage. On May 4 Mr. Beaupre writes Mr. Hay as follows:

SIR: I have the honor to advise that the opposition to the ratification of the canal convention is intensifying. The press is teeming with articles rancorous in enmity to the proposed treaty, while public opinion is veering into a current of extreme bitterness against the authors of the pact, especially Mr. Herran.

Again on May 7 he writes, referring to the fact that he has met a gentleman of prominence and influence:

His views are interesting and entitled to consideration, and from them I gather that the tremendous tide of public opinion against the canal treaty is appalling to the Government, and there is, in consequence, a diversity of opinion among its members as to the proper course to pursue. Some are in favor of forcing confirmation through Congress, while others, dreading the effect of such action in the present state of the public mind, counsel moderation and delay, and the adoption of measures to change public sentiment into a more favorable channel.

Can we wonder, Mr. President, under these circumstances, with public opinion apparently united against the ratification of the treaty, that the Colombian Congress should hesitate and delay, notwithstanding the assertion often made that the Colombian Government could, had it so desired, have secured the ratification of the treaty? I read from the dispatch of June 10, from Mr. Beaupre to Mr. Hay, merely these words:

SIR: Evidently a decided effort is being made to change public opinion into a more favorable consideration of the canal convention. Many strong men are now supporting it who but a short time ago were with the opposition. The great majority of people still continue to believe, however, that the convention will not be ratified.

After alternate hopes and fears on the part of Mr. Beaupre in regard to the ratification of the treaty, it was finally, of course, made conclusive that the treaty would not be ratified by the Colombian Senate. While Mr. Beaupre conveys the idea in some of his dispatches that the Government, if in earnest, could procure the ratification of the treaty, others show clearly that the Government itself was solicitous concerning the state of the public mind, as it might well be.

Under such conditions, Mr. President, as to race—I particularly call attention to this—environment, state of civilization, and I may say, too, medieval and racial notions of diplomacy, is it a matter of wonder that there was no adequate appreciation of their own best interests, no very fine sense of international obligation, and that the Colombian people and Government made their great mistakes and "stood in their own light, and as a result lost out in 'The great adventure of Panama'?"

She lost; and in great degree her loss was our great gain. How and wherein we gained was shown in the able address of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I adopt with him the maxim *ex quo et bono* as applicable to the case.

Mr. President, we are referred to the many revolutions, insurrections, riots, disturbances in Panama prior to 1903, "53 of them in 53 years," it has been said. Yet when the Hay-Herran treaty was negotiated, and during all the time its ratification was being considered by the Colombian Senate, Panama was a part of Colombia. The very terms of the treaty recognized that fact. The whole theory of the treaty was based on the sovereign and territorial jurisdiction of Colombia over Panama. We are estopped, therefore, from raising any question as to the sovereignty of Colombia. Revolutions were of frequent occurrence and of long duration in other parts of her domain, due in large part to the conditions of race, environment, and state of civilization to which I have already alluded.

Mr. President, referring to the language quoted from Mr. Hay, we can hardly say now that "our sister Republics to the south of us are perfectly convinced of the sincerity of our attitude." They see Colombia's loss; they know our great gain. They are Latin-American; we are Anglo-Saxon, or American, if you please, without any hyphen. They are more or less suspicious; and until this matter is adjusted American trade, commerce, and business will not find cordial reception there. Our

commercial relations with South American countries should be extended and developed both for their good and ours.

But there is that one cloud on the horizon—the unadjusted controversy between the United States and Colombia. Why not end the controversy? We shall have, I hope, the treaty of amity and commerce following the ratification of this, with the opportunities for the investment of American capital which will follow that; but whether we do or not, we shall have forever ended all cause of grievance and paved the way for our proper high place in the confidence of all our sister Republics to the south of us.

Mr. President, I hope we shall never again have a world war, and that the Panama Canal may bear upon its bosom only ships of trade—"trade, the calm health of nations," and not ships of war for purposes of war. But while I hope this, the day may come when the preservation unimpaired of the canal, the maintenance of its fortifications, will be essential to our very life. At such a time I shall want to see the nation whose territory so nearly borders the Canal Zone on cordial terms of friendship with the United States and her people. It seems to me that this is a consideration worth while.

Mr. President, we are a great nation of nearly 110,000,000 people; there is none more powerful or resourceful in all the world. We can afford to be tolerant, even generous, to the weaker republics of the Western Hemisphere. We shall by so doing lose the respect of none, but, as I verily believe, win the admiration of all. If in our toleration we may seem to bend or stoop, it will be but to conquer, and that conquest will be one of amity and good will, one that will greatly advance the prestige of our great country in that part of the world where it is most needed.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I merely desire to take a few moments to explain my position upon this "mental anguish" treaty. There are three or four reasons why I can not support it. One is that by ratifying it we are casting reflections upon the Government of the United States; another is that we owe Colombia nothing; another is that, if there is anything due, certainly the amount of \$25,000,000 is excessive; and another reason is that the treaty as proposed is full of the seeds of trouble.

Mr. President, I do not feel it incumbent upon me to defend the memory of Col. Roosevelt; it is not necessary on my part to do that; but, on the other hand, I am not disposed gratuitously and voluntarily to heap ignominy upon his name. He accomplished one of the greatest achievements of modern times.

I have listened to most of the arguments which have been presented on this floor, but I have heard no reason advanced why the majority of this Chamber should change their position from that formerly taken by them. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] made a very clear speech on this point. He said he investigated the transaction when the incidents were fresh, about 1903, and that he had seen no reason since then to change his mind. That statement has very great weight with me.

Mr. President, as I have said, one of the reasons why I oppose this treaty is that we owe Colombia nothing. Without trying to go into the details of the concession granted to the French company, I can not believe that those representing our Government at the time the French concession was acquired would be so far forgetful of the interests of the people of this country as to throw away \$40,000,000 for nothing. It seems to me by buying that hole in the ground down there for \$40,000,000 we also acquired the right to go ahead and complete it, and that we succeeded to all the rights of the French company, for it would be an absolute waste of money to buy something that we could not use and which we had no right to complete.

In the next place, we donated or appropriated and paid Panama \$10,000,000. Now, without going through all the history of the matter—we have all heard that—we know that that money was paid, and paid to a people who were in possession of that territory at that time. We have made those people down there rich; we have made them prosperous; and they ought to be happy if they can get out of this mental state that they are in and stop asking for more money. The taxpayers of this country have to be considered, and I do not know when we are going to call a halt if this administration is going to start out with this payment.

It would well pay those people if they had even given the franchise, without any compensation whatever. Their country was inaccessible, without roads, without communication, and when we took charge of it these lakes and lagoons were there, breeding sickness. We made it a prosperous country; we showed them how to improve their health and how to live happily and contentedly if they would go along and do so; so, as I have said, they could well have donated that privilege, and they would

have been handsomely paid by our going on and completing the canal.

Mr. President, I feel that the earth was made for the habitation of man, and the fact that some people get possession of some particular part of it is no reason why they should forever keep back progress and prosperity in this world. I respect small nations and weak people. Their rights should be carefully guarded and we should be willing to compensate the weak. Not only should we be just to them, but we should be willing to be even liberal with them, as I feel that we have been with the people down there. But this great enterprise was needed, and now for us to go back and try to undo what was done and find out all about the details of it and who was guilty, this man or that man, and try to heap shame upon the memory of some of our people, is more than I propose to undertake to do.

If a majority of my colleagues over on this side want to undertake to correct all the sins and the wrongs of the Republican Party they are assuming a good deal more than I am willing to join with them in doing. We have heard them talk on the other side of the aisle here for the past few years about entangling alliances, and if you will read this treaty I do not see how it could be much more entangling. So I am going to accord them the credit of being conscientious and not wanting to become entangled, and I must confess that I am a little confused as to why they want to ratify this treaty.

Any schoolboy lawyer will tell you, just from looking at the paper on its face, without knowing anything about the history, that it is full of the seeds of trouble.

The idea of a great country like this buying a piece of property and expending \$400,000,000 on it and not having a good title to it, but allowing the other fellow to come back and use it whenever he sees fit, as it were! It is like buying a house and letting the seller reserve the right to use a room in it, come and visit and stay as long as he pleases, and all that kind of thing. Why, we will have endless trouble.

There is no use in going through all the concessions that are made here to them, or the grants or the rights or the privileges. If we do this, we can not manage our own property, and this Government should be too big for a thing like that. We should manage our affairs according to our own ideas, without having to consult Colombia or anybody else.

For these reasons, briefly, I propose to vote against the ratification of the treaty.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not share the apprehension which seems to prevail in the minds of some of my friends upon this side of the Chamber. The fame of Theodore Roosevelt is secure for all time. His place in the history of the world is established, and nothing that we can do or say at this moment will either lessen the one or disturb the other.

If I believed that the Government of the United States, through the instrumentality of Theodore Roosevelt, had wronged Colombia, I would not hesitate, notwithstanding my friendship for that great man in his life and my reverence for his memory now that he has gone, to acknowledge the wrong and make reparation for it. I am not concerned either in the consistency or the inconsistency of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I have this to assure me: I believe he did what he regarded as his duty when this treaty was first reported to the Senate, and I assume that he intends to do his duty now as he understands it.

Like the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], it is exceedingly repugnant to me to challenge the motives of any of my brother Senators—indeed, to challenge the motives of any man—unless I have conclusive evidence that he is evilly disposed. Consistency or inconsistency ought not to have the least influence upon Senators as they come to vote upon this important subject.

Mr. President, it is far from my purpose to present an argument covering the infinite detail of the controversy between the United States of America and the United States of Colombia which has been stated and restated, debated and redebated with increasing bitterness for more than 17 years. My sole purpose is to put on the record in the briefest possible way the reasons which have impelled me to the conclusion which I will presently express in my vote. Three principal arguments have been submitted to the Senate in favor of the treaty under consideration. They illustrate three wholly different views, entirely irreconcilable with each other, having but one point of agreement, namely, that the treaty should be ratified. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], has convinced himself that the treaty should be ratified because the United States, through Theodore Roosevelt, then President, fomented and encouraged the revolution which occurred in the State of Panama on November 3, 1903, and by armed force prevented Colombia from suppressing the revolution, and with indecent haste recognized Panama as an independent nation, and immediately thereafter

entered into negotiations with the Republic of Panama looking to a treaty granting to this country the rights and privileges which enabled it to construct the Panama Canal.

If this position is sound, then, in my judgment, the proposed treaty with Colombia is in the last degree dishonorable, both as respects that country and as respects our own. If Theodore Roosevelt, as President of the United States, was guilty of the charge laid at his door by the Senator from Ohio, the United States not only grossly violated the treaty obligations existing between it and Colombia but repudiated the fundamental principles of international morality, and the only atonement commensurate with the crime is a public confession of our wrongdoing, the restoration of Panama to the sovereignty of Colombia by our Army and Navy, and the delivery to Colombia of the Panama Canal, accompanied by a surrender of all our rights for its use and operation, and all our property incidental to the great enterprise in which we have engaged.

I can not accept the view of the Senator from Ohio, simply because a somewhat careful study of the subject has convinced me that the United States in no instance failed to observe with meticulous nicety all the obligations imposed by our treaty of 1846 with Colombia, and all the requirements of international law, and that we stand before the world without a stain upon our honor in our dealings with that unfortunate country. I do not overlook our anxiety to proceed promptly with the construction of the canal, and I do not doubt that having failed to reach an agreement with Colombia and having abandoned all hope of arriving at any understanding with that country the President, and with him all the people of the United States, were gratified to find that a situation had arisen which gave us the privilege of treating with Panama as the successor of Colombia upon the Isthmus. It is, however, a grievous injustice to our country to insist that simply because a situation which arose was to our advantage that therefore we conspired to bring it about.

The Senator from Pennsylvania, justifying in the most conclusive way everything that the United States did in its relations to Colombia and to the revolution in Panama and establishing beyond any controversy whatever that when we recognized Panama as an independent State and entered into a treaty with her for the construction of the canal we were pursuing a lawful and upright course, nevertheless favors the ratification of the treaty upon the ground that we ought to be generous and compensate Colombia in whole or in part for an injury that she inflicted upon herself—inflicted upon herself not because of a mistake in judgment or in policy but because she was avaricious and wanted to extract from the United States the last penny which our necessities might prompt us to pay.

The Senator from Pennsylvania expressly disclaims any liability, either legal or moral, to Colombia on account of anything we did in our relations with that country, and he places his argument in behalf of the treaty distinctly upon the outcome of our subsequent dealings with Panama. It is to be inferred from his argument that if the United States had not secured better terms in our treaty with Panama than we would have secured if the Hay-Herran treaty had been fully ratified, the moral obligation to pay something to Colombia would not exist. I quote very briefly from his address:

What we gained is the difference between the proposed Hay-Herran treaty with Colombia and the Hay-Bunau Varilla treaty with Panama, which I have heretofore summarized.

The value of these differences to us is the measure of our moral liability.

It has been frequently asked what we are getting under this treaty. That is not the point; it is what we have already received that makes the treaty consonable and just.

At the close of his address I made the following inquiry:

As I understand the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania, it is that Colombia has a moral claim against the United States, not for what Colombia has lost but for what the United States has gained. Does the Senator mean for what the United States has gained by the construction of the canal, or does he mean what the United States has gained in comparing the terms of the treaty proposed with Colombia and the treaty actually consummated with Panama?

Senator Knox replied:

I think I would prefer to state my proposition just the other way, not that Colombia has a moral claim against the United States for what she has lost, but that the United States is under moral obligation to Colombia for what she has lost. In saying what she has lost I tried to make it perfectly plain that the measure of our obligation was the difference in value to us of a charter, as it were, and the foundation upon which the canal was built.

I find it wholly impossible to bring my mind into agreement with the reasoning of the Senator from Pennsylvania if this country did no wrong to Colombia and it was able thereafter to make better terms with Panama. Assuming all this, we were perfectly free to contract with Panama. The altruism which would transfer to Colombia the advantages which belong to the

people of the United States is perilously near infidelity to our own Government. I can not believe that we would be justified in paying to Colombia this vast sum of money and increasing accordingly the burdens of taxation, already well-nigh insupportable, simply because Panama was willing to be fair and Colombia was not.

Furthermore, the real object which the Senator from Pennsylvania seeks to accomplish would not be accomplished. It is a matter of judgment, of course, but it is my opinion that this treaty instead of enhancing among the South American countries our reputation for honor and justice would have just the contrary effect, and this is especially true of Colombia. In this respect our last estate would be infinitely worse than it is now.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] proceeds upon an entirely different theory. He agrees with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox] that the United States did no wrong to Colombia, and that it is impossible for men of honest minds to honestly differ with respect to that phase of the subject. He states the foundation of his support of the treaty in the following paragraph:

The question of the amount of the indemnity, to which I was strongly opposed, I became convinced carried with it no admission as to the past of any kind, but was simply a question of money and of the amount to be paid in consideration of the recognition by Colombia of the independence of Panama and of the boundaries and for the extinction of certain money claims resting upon treaties made long prior to 1903.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that Colombia has a money claim against the United States, with respect to the validity of which or the merit of which men may honestly differ. I refer to the claim arising out of the building and operation of the Panama Railroad. Colombia granted to a New York corporation the right to build and operate a railroad across the Isthmus of Panama long prior to any thought, or immediate thought, of building the Panama Canal. That company agreed to pay to the State of Colombia \$250,000 each year—at least that sum—for the privilege of operating the railroad, and at the end of the franchise, or 99 years, the property itself was to revert to Colombia.

We guaranteed, in the treaty of 1846, not only the sovereignty of Colombia over the Isthmus of Panama, but we guaranteed the property of Colombia in that territory. There is a vast difference, as every lawyer knows, between guaranteeing sovereignty and guaranteeing property. This railroad was built and was in operation long before we took up with Colombia the matter of negotiating the Hay-Herran treaty. While I do not think that the claim is valid, I believe that the subsequent transfer of the new Panama Canal Co. to the United States obliterated the claim that Colombia had for the annual payment. Nevertheless, I conceive it to be a question upon which men might differ. If this treaty was founded upon a compromise between the United States and Colombia for the settlement of the claims arising out of the railroad which we afterwards secured and which we always intend to retain, I would not find it difficult to vote for the treaty.

But the difficulty is that the ground upon which the Senator from Massachusetts places in part his support of the treaty is not covered by the treaty at all. When this treaty is ratified Colombia will have against us precisely the same claim which she has now, and we will be compelled either to arbitrate or to compromise it. It is idle for anyone even to suggest that this treaty settles or adjusts this, the only claim which Colombia can in good faith make against the United States. Why it was not introduced into this treaty so that we might reach an end of the controversy I do not know. But so far as I am concerned I do not intend to be put in the position of paying this claim twice, or paying Colombia \$25,000,000 with the knowledge that the next day she can assert again precisely the claim which she has been asserting for the last 17 years. How anyone can do it is a mystery to me and beyond my power of understanding.

The only thing which Colombia gives to the United States is an agreement to recognize the State of Panama, and I say of that, as I said of the basis suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], that for the United States to buy from Colombia a recognition of the State of Panama is to dishonor the United States and to dishonor Colombia as well. That is not a subject of purchase or sale. The world will repudiate the policy or the principle which leads to a result of that character.

One more word and I have finished. We grant to Colombia in this treaty special privileges in the Panama Canal that are palpably, obviously, I was about to say admittedly, in violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, under which the canal was built, and equally in violation of the treaties which we have with every country in the world, substantially. Why anybody ven-

tures to proceed in violation of these obligations I can not understand. If we ratify this treaty, we are simply surrendering the Panama Canal to the world upon the terms that are provided in the treaty now under consideration. I for one can not bring myself to do that thing, much as I would like to follow the President of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I had not intended to have anything to say in reference to this treaty. But the circumstances are such that I feel it to be my duty to state the compelling reasons why I shall vote for this treaty, and those compelling reasons are those which were written in the year 1903, both in word and in act.

I have taken pains at former times and during this discussion to study closely the acts of our Government in reference to this matter, and I hail with delight the position we now take and which certain of us have always held. Being the strong Nation that we are, we are making reparation for having taken advantage of a weak nation in the hour of its extreme weakness.

It is needless for me to say, Mr. President, that in taking the position I am taking I am doing it not because any of the late and subsequent reasons that have actuated others to change their positions. In recounting the history of our obtaining the Panama Canal, for the sake of charity we may say it was done under the impulse and desire to accomplish the most stupendous engineering feat that was ever accomplished. But the ends did not justify the means. We had an option to go forward and build the canal. We could have negotiated with another country to build the canal. The manner in which we took it and the manner in which we have held that domain is not to the credit of America, and I say here to-day, now that this vote is about to be taken, that if we ratify this treaty it will be in a measure to reestablish a relation that America should never have broken. We did that over which for 17 years there has been a storm of protest, both from this country and from the country that was wronged. I take no stock in the statement that we are trying to pay for a wrong that Colombia did herself; but we are in a measure trying to make restitution for a wrong we did Colombia.

I shall vote for the treaty because of the position I took at the time that the act was committed, as I see no reason to change at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 4 o'clock p. m.). Under the unanimous-consent agreement the treaty will be proceeded with article by article without further debate. The Secretary will read the first amendment reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Committee on Foreign Relations propose to strike out all of Article I, in the following words:

ARTICLE I.

The Government of the United States of America, wishing to put at rest all controversies and differences with the Republic of Colombia arising out of the events from which the present situation on the Isthmus of Panama resulted, expresses, in its own name and in the name of the people of the United States, sincere regret that anything should have occurred to interrupt or to mar the relations of cordial friendship that had so long subsisted between the two nations.

The Government of the Republic of Colombia, in its own name and in the name of the Colombian people, accepts this declaration in the full assurance that every obstacle to the restoration of complete harmony between the two countries will thus disappear.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I gave notice that I would offer certain amendments to the treaty. One of my amendments proposes a substitute for the preamble. I do not know the proper form in order to present the amendments.

Mr. LODGE. The committee amendments should be disposed of first.

Mr. RANSDELL. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to strike out the language just read by the Secretary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee propose, on page 2, to strike out the Roman numerals "II," after the word "Article," and insert the Roman numeral "I."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Article I reads as follows:

The Republic of Colombia shall enjoy the following rights, in respect to the interoceanic canal and the Panama Railways—

On line 2, after the word "Railways," the committee propose to strike out the colon, insert a comma and the following words:

The title to which is now vested entirely and absolutely in the United States of America, without any encumbrances or indemnities whatever.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

1. The Republic of Colombia shall be at liberty at all times to transport through the interoceanic canal its troops, materials of war, and ships of war—

In line 3, after the words "ships of war" and after the comma, the committee propose to strike out the words "even in case of war between Colombia and another country."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, it is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

without paying any charges to the United States.

2. The products of the soil and industry of Colombia passing through the canal, as well as the Colombian mails, shall be exempt from any charge or duty other than those to which the products and mails of the United States may be subject. The products of the soil and industry of Colombia, such as cattle, salt, and provisions, shall be admitted to entry in the Canal Zone, and likewise in the islands and mainland occupied by the United States as auxiliary and accessory thereto, without paying other duties or charges than those payable by similar products of the United States.

3. Colombian citizens crossing the Canal Zone shall, upon production of paper proof of their nationality, be exempt from every toll, tax, or duty to which citizens of the United States are not subject.

4.—
In line 1 the committee propose to strike out the words "during the construction of the interoceanic canal and afterwards whenever" and insert the single word "whenever."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

Whenever traffic by the canal is interrupted or whenever it shall be necessary for any other reason to use the railway the troops, materials of war, products, and mails of the Republic of Colombia, as above mentioned, shall—

After the word "shall" the committee propose to strike out the comma and the words "even in case of war between Colombia and another country."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

be transported on the railway between Ancon and Cristobal or on any other railway substituted therefor, paying only the same charges and duties as are imposed upon the troops, materials of war, products, and mails of the United States. The officers, agents, and employees of the Government of Colombia shall, upon production of proper proof of their official character or their employment, also be entitled to passage on the said railway on the same terms as officers, agents, and employees of the Government of the United States—

After the words last read the committee propose to strike out the sentence "The provisions of this paragraph shall not, however, apply in case of war between Colombia and Panama."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

Coal, petroleum, and sea salt, being the products of Colombia—

After the word "Colombia" the committee propose to insert the words "for Colombian consumption."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

Passing from the Atlantic Coast of Colombia to any Colombian port on the Pacific coast, and vice versa, shall—

After the word "shall," in line 4, the committee propose to insert the words "whenever traffic by the canal is interrupted."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

be transported over the aforesaid railway free of any charge except the actual cost of handling and transportation, which shall not in any case exceed one-half of the ordinary freight charges levied upon similar products of the United States passing over the railway and in transit from one port to another of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to Article I as amended.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Are we to understand that the question is now that the articles as amended shall be agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The one article.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it possible to offer amendments subsequent to that agreement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Amendments may be offered to the article by individual Senators.

Mr. BORAH. I understand we are about to vote on the entire article?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On Article I as amended.

Mr. BORAH. We would therefore be supposed to offer amendments, if we had any amendments to offer to that article, before we vote on the entire article?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Such amendments are now in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask that there may be presented to the Senate the amendment which I have already had read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In line 4 of section 2 of Article I, page 2, the Senator from Washington proposes to amend by striking out the words "the United States may be subject," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "nations other than the United States may be subject under the treaties and laws of the United States."

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask for the yeas and nays on that.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I understand that I am relieved on all votes on the treaty, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HALE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. I understand, however, that I am released from the pair on all votes on the treaty. I will therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] upon the final vote only on the treaty, I am advised. I am therefore at liberty to vote on the pending amendment. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. EDGE. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I am informed, however, that if he were present he would vote on the pending measure as I propose to vote, and I am therefore released from the pair for all votes concerning the treaty. With that understanding I vote "nay."

Mr. HARRISON. I have a pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and I withhold my vote. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Ashurst	Jones, N. Mex.	McKellar	Simmons
Borah	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Townsend
Capper	Kellogg	Nelson	Trammell
Caraway	Kendrick	Norbeck	Wadsworth
Cummins	Kenyon	Norris	Watson, Ga.
Dial	La Follette	Pittman	Wolcott
Gerry	Lenroot	Poindexter	
Johnson	McCormick	Reed	

NAYS—59.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McLean	Smoot
Brandeggee	Glass	Moses	Spencer
Broussard	Gooding	Myers	Stanfield
Bursum	Hale	New	Stanley
Calder	Harreld	Nicholson	Sterling
Cameron	Harris	Oddie	Sutherland
Colt	Heflin	Overman	Swanson
Culberson	Hitchcock	Penrose	Underwood
Curtis	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	King	Pomerene	Warren
Edge	Knox	Ransdell	Watson, Ind.
Ernst	Ladd	Robinson	Weller
Fernald	Lodge	Sheppard	Williams
Fletcher	McCumber	Shortridge	Willis
France	McKinley	Smith	

NOT VOTING—7.

Elkins	Newberry	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Harrison	Owen	Shields	

So Mr. POINDEXTER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I offer an amendment to the second paragraph of the first article of the treaty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out section 1 of Article I as amended, which reads as follows:

1. The Republic of Colombia shall be at liberty at all times to transport through the interoceanic canal its troops, materials of war, and ships of war, without paying any charges to the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BORAH. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I understand that if he were present, he would vote "nay." If at liberty to vote I should vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 28, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Ashurst	Johnson	Lenroot	Poindexter
Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	McKellar	Reed
Capper	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Simmons
Caraway	Kellogg	Nelson	Townsend
Cummins	Kendrick	Norbeck	Trammell
Dial	Kenyon	Norris	Wadsworth
Harris	La Follette	Overman	Watson, Ga.

NAYS—61.

Ball	Gerry	Moses	Stanfield
Brandeggee	Glass	Myers	Stanley
Broussard	Gooding	New	Sterling
Bursum	Hale	Nicholson	Sutherland
Calder	Harreld	Oddie	Swanson
Cameron	Heflin	Penrose	Underwood
Colt	Hitchcock	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Culberson	Keyes	Pittman	Warren
Curtis	King	Pomerene	Watson, Ind.
Dillingham	Knox	Ransdell	Weller
Edge	Ladd	Robinson	Williams
Ernst	Lodge	Sheppard	Willis
Fernald	McCormick	Shortridge	Wolcott
Fletcher	McCumber	Smith	
France	McKinley	Smoot	
Frelinghuysen	McLean	Spencer	

NOT VOTING—7.

Elkins	Newberry	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Harrison	Owen	Shields	

So Mr. POINDEXTER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a brief extract from—

Mr. LODGE. I think at this stage of the proceedings that is out of order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course it is out of order, but I am asking unanimous consent.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to the extract being printed, but I think it is out of order at this stage of the proceedings.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator can ask to have it printed after the treaty is ratified.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask permission that it be printed at such time as is considered proper at the conclusion of the proceedings on the treaty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not know whether that is an immediate request for unanimous consent or not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand that it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object to any request for unanimous consent now.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask the Secretary to read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In line 1 of section 1 of Article I it is proposed to strike out the words "at all times" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "except during war between Colombia and another country with which the United States is at peace," so as to read:

The Republic of Colombia shall be at liberty, except during war between Colombia and another country with which the United States is at peace, to transport through the interoceanic canal its troops, materials of war, and ships of war without paying any charges to the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH and Mr. BORAH asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], I understand if he were present he would vote "nay." If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 39, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Ashurst	Harris	La Follette	Poindexter
Borah	Heflin	Lenroot	Reed
Capper	Hitchcock	McKellar	Simmons
Caraway	Johnson	McLean	Townsend
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Trammell
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Wadsworth
Dial	Kellogg	Norbeck	Watson, Ga.
Ernst	Kendrick	Norris	Willis
Gerry	Kenyon	Overman	Wolcott
Harreld	Knox	Pittman	

NAYS—50.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	New	Stanfield
Brandeggee	Glass	Nicholson	Stanley
Broussard	Gooding	Oddie	Sterling
Bursum	Hale	Penrose	Sutherland
Calder	Keyes	Phipps	Swanson
Cameron	King	Pomerene	Underwood
Colt	Ladd	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Lodge	Robinson	Warren
Dillingham	McCormick	Sheppard	Watson, Ind.
Edge	McCumber	Shortridge	Weller
Fernald	McKinley	Smith	Williams
Fletcher	Moses	Smoot	
France	Myers	Spencer	

NOT VOTING—7.

Elkins	Newberry	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Harrison	Owen	Shields	

So Mr. WADSWORTH's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are no further amendments to Article I. The question is on agreeing to Article I as amended.

Mr. BORAH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to Article I as amended.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This is not a vote on the ratification of the treaty as yet.

Mr. LODGE. If I may say so, a ye-and-nay vote on the ratification of the treaty is required by the rule.

Mr. PENROSE. Let us have a roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to Article I as amended.

Mr. REED. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], I withhold my vote. I understand that if the Senator from West Virginia were present he would vote "yea." If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 65, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—65.

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	McLean	Spencer
Ball	Gerry	Moses	Stanfield
Brandeggee	Glass	Myers	Stanley
Broussard	Gooding	New	Sterling
Bursum	Hale	Nicholson	Sutherland
Calder	Harrell	Oddie	Swanson
Cameron	Heflin	Overman	Underwood
Caraway	Hitchcock	Penrose	Walsh, Mass.
Colt	Kendrick	Phipps	Warren
Culberson	Keyes	Pittman	Watson, Ind.
Curtis	King	Pomerene	Weller
Dillingham	Knox	Ransdell	Williams
Edge	Ladd	Robinson	Willis
Ernst	Lodge	Sheppard	Wolcott
Fernald	McCormick	Shortridge	
Fletcher	McCumber	Smith	
France	McKinley	Smoot	

NAYS—24.

Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	McKellar	Reed
Capper	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Simmons
Cummins	Kellogg	Nelson	Townsend
Dial	Kenyon	Norbeck	Trammell
Harris	La Follette	Norris	Wadsworth
Johnson	Lenroot	Poindexter	Watson, Ga.

NOT VOTING—7.

Elkins	Newberry	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Harrison	Owen	Shields	

So Article I as amended was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

Article III—

The committee proposes to strike out the Roman numerals "III" and to insert in lieu thereof the numerals "II."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

The United States of America—

After the word "The," the first word of Article II, it is proposed to insert the words "Government of the."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

The United States of America agrees to pay—

After the word "pay" it is proposed to insert the words "at the city of Washington."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

To the Republic of Colombia—

After the word "Colombia" and the comma it is proposed to strike out the words—

within six months after the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

The sum of \$25,000,000, gold, United States money.

After the word "money" the committee proposes to strike out the period and insert a comma and the following words:

as follows: The sum of \$5,000,000 shall be paid within six months after the exchange of ratifications of the present treaty, and reckoning from the date of that payment, the remaining \$20,000,000 shall be paid in four annual installments of \$5,000,000 each.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. We are voting upon this treaty article by article. Is it not necessary to have the same vote to adopt it article by article as on the final vote? I am raising the question as to Article I, I believe, on which we have had a record vote. The vote was 65 to 24, and I want to reserve the point that it requires a two-thirds vote to adopt the treaty article by article, exactly the same as it does to adopt the whole treaty on the final vote.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on the point of order, of course, the vote to which the Senator refers is more than two-thirds; but the only vote requiring two-thirds is the one on the resolution which ratifies the treaty. None of these votes ratify the treaty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the last amendment read. Without objection, it is agreed to.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, before putting the vote on the adoption of that article, I wish to propose a substitute for the article.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What became of the amendment just read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was agreed to.

Mr. RANDELL. Before voting on the article itself as agreed to, I wish to offer a substitute for it; and in order that Senators may vote intelligently on my substitute, I ask that the two very brief articles preceding my substitute may be read, as well as the substitute itself.

Mr. PENROSE. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. I think anything that can be classified as debate or explanation is out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. RANDELL. What is the objection to having it read? These are simply articles that will be offered afterwards.

I ask, then, that the substitute be read. The amendment is to strike out Article II of the treaty and to insert in lieu thereof an article to be known as Article III.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

ARTICLE III.

In consideration of the above concessions and benefits accruing to the United States of America, and in consideration of expenditures which Colombia must make if she is to be in a position to cooperate and assist the United States of America in the defense of the Panama Canal, as provided in Article I of the treaty, the Government of the United States of America agrees to pay at the city of Washington to the Republic of Colombia the sum of \$30,000,000, gold, United States money, as follows: The sum of \$5,000,000 shall be paid within six months after the exchange of ratification of this treaty, and reckoning the date of that payment, the remaining \$25,000,000 shall be paid in five annual installments of \$5,000,000 each; and further, the Government of the United States of America obligates itself to loan to the Government of Colombia a sum not to exceed \$25,000,000 to aid in the improvement of its harbor and waterways, and to complete railroad connections between its principal centers of population and the Atlantic and Pacific seaboard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL].

Mr. NORRIS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] has offered an amendment to the text. Should not that be voted on before the substitute is voted on, and will it not be out of order after the substitute is voted on? I call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that his amendment striking out "twenty-five" and inserting "fifteen" before the word "million" ought to be voted on first, before a vote is taken on the substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has not yet offered his amendment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I offered it, or at least I understood that it constituted an offer. It was presented and read, and I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry. I do not desire to offer any amendment to the substitute proposed by the Senator from Louisiana. I desire to offer an amendment to the article as amended by the Senate, as it is now pending. My parliamentary inquiry is, Whether it is necessary to vote upon my amendment before we vote upon the substitute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I assume that the ordinary rule prevails in the consideration of amendments to the

treaty, just as if it were a bill or a resolution, in which case any article would have to be perfected before a substitute for the preamble would be in order.

Mr. LODGE. There is no doubt of that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Washington, if offered, is in order prior to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana to the preamble.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I offered the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Washington moves to amend by striking out the words "twenty-five," on the last line of the printed amendments, before the words "million dollars," and inserting in lieu thereof the word "fifteen," so that it will read:

The Government of the United States of America agrees to pay at the city of Washington to the Republic of Colombia the sum of \$15,000,000 gold, United States money, etc.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered and taken.

Mr. HARRISON. I find that I can vote on this question notwithstanding the pair I have with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay." I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 68, as follows:

YEAS—22.

Borah	Kellogg	Nelson	Townsend
Capper	Kenyon	Norbeck	Trammell
Cummins	La Follette	Norris	Wadsworth
Dial	Lenroot	Poinexter	Watson, Ga.
Johnson	McKellar	Reed	
Jones, Wash.	McNary	Simmons	

NAYS—68.

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Shortridge
Ball	Gerry	McCumber	Smith
Brandegge	Glass	McKinley	Smoot
Broussard	Gooding	McLean	Spencer
Bursum	Hale	Moses	Stanfield
Calder	Harrell	Myers	Stanley
Cameron	Harris	New	Sterling
Caraway	Harrison	Nicholson	Sutherland
Colt	Heflin	Oddie	Swanson
Culberson	Hitchcock	Overman	Underwood
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Kendrick	Phipps	Warren
Edge	Keyes	Pittman	Watson, Ind.
Ernst	King	Pomerene	Weller
Fernald	Knox	Ransdell	Williams
Fletcher	Ladd	Robinson	Willis
France	Lodge	Sheppard	Wolcott

NOT VOTING—6.

Elkins	Owen	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Newberry	Page		

So Mr. POINDEXTER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the word "each," in the last line of Article II, insert a semicolon and the following words:

That neither said payment nor anything contained in this treaty shall be taken or regarded as an admission that the secession of Panama in November, 1903, was in any way aided or abetted by the United States of America, its agents, or representatives, or that said Government in any way violated its obligations to Colombia.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the amendment be read again, Mr. President.

The Assistant Secretary again read the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I understand that my pair, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], if present would vote "nay." I therefore feel at liberty to vote, and I vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 39, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Borah	Johnson	McCumber	Spencer
Brandegge	Jones, Wash.	McKinley	Sterling
Calder	Kellogg	McNary	Sutherland
Capper	Kendrick	Moses	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Nelson	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Keyes	Norbeck	Watson, Ga.
Edge	Ladd	Norris	Watson, Ind.
Ernst	Lenroot	Poinexter	Weller
Fernald	Lodge	Reed	Willis
Hale	McCormick	Smoot	

NAYS—49.

Ashurst	Bursum	Colt	Fletcher
Ball	Cameron	Culberson	France
Broussard	Caraway	Curtis	Frelinghuysen

Gerry	La Follette	Pittman	Swanson
Glass	McKellar	Pomerene	Trammell
Gooding	McLean	Ransdell	Underwood
Harrell	Myers	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Harris	New	Sheppard	Warren
Harrison	Nicholson	Shortridge	Williams
Heflin	Oddie	Simmons	Wolcott
Hitchcock	Overman	Smith	
Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Stanfield	
King	Phipps	Stanley	

NOT VOTING—8.

Dial	Knox	Owen	Shields
Elkins	Newberry	Page	Walsh, Mont.

So Mr. BORAH's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the substitute offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ASHURST. Let it be read.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask that the substitute be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the substitute offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In lieu of Article II, the Senator from Louisiana proposes to insert the following:

ARTICLE III.

In consideration of the above concessions and benefits accruing to the United States of America, and in consideration of expenditures which Colombia must make if she is to be in a position to cooperate and assist the United States of America in the defense of the Panama Canal, as provided in Article I of the treaty, the Government of the United States of America agrees to pay at the city of Washington to the Republic of Colombia the sum of \$30,000,000 gold United States money, as follows: The sum of \$5,000,000 shall be paid within six months after the exchange of ratifications of this treaty, and reckoning from the date of that payment the remaining \$25,000,000 shall be paid in five annual installments of \$5,000,000 each; and further the Government of the United States of America obligates itself to loan to the Government of Colombia a sum not to exceed \$25,000,000 to aid in the improvement of its harbors and waterways and to complete railroad connections between its principal centers of population and the Atlantic and Pacific seaboard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute offered by the Senator from Louisiana. [Putting the question.] The substitute is rejected. The question now is on agreeing to the article as amended.

The article as amended was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

Article IV—

The committee proposes to strike out the Roman numerals "IV" and insert the Roman numerals "III."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

The Republic of Colombia recognizes Panama as an independent nation, and taking as a basis the Colombian law of June 9, 1855, agrees that the boundary shall be the following: From Cape Tiburon to the headwaters of the Rio de la Miel and following the mountain chain by the ridge of Gandi to the Sierra de Chugargun and that of Mali going down by the ridges of Nigue to the heights of Aspave and from thence to a point on the Pacific half way between Cocalito and La Arvita.

In consideration of this recognition, the Government of the United States will, immediately after the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty, take the necessary steps in order to obtain from the Government of Panama the dispatch of a duly accredited agent to negotiate and conclude with the Government of Colombia a treaty of peace and friendship, with a view to bring about both the establishment of regular diplomatic relations between Colombia and Panama and the adjustment of all questions of pecuniary liability as between the two countries, in accordance with recognized principles of law and precedents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the article.

The article was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

Article V—

The committee proposes to strike out the Roman numeral "V" and insert the Roman numerals "IV."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY (reading):

The present treaty shall be approved and ratified by the high contracting parties in conformity with their respective laws, and the ratifications thereof shall be exchanged in the city of Bogota as soon as may be possible.

In faith whereof the said plenipotentiaries have signed the present treaty in duplicate and have hereunto affixed their respective seals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the last article.

The article was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. There is an amendment in the preamble that must now be made.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee proposes an amendment to the preamble, as follows—

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, is it in order to introduce other proposed articles before taking up the preamble? I have

two proposed new articles, and I wish to know whether it is in order to take them up now or after the preamble is acted on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They should be taken up now.

Mr. RANDELL. I send to the desk two new articles, which I offer. Let the two be read together.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the articles.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

ARTICLE I.

Colombia agrees to cooperate with and assist the United States in defending the Panama Canal, both by land and by sea, to the end that the canal and its approaches may be protected from aggression by any other nation or country in contravention of the obligations now imposed upon the canal by existing treaties to which the United States of America is a party.

ARTICLE II.

Colombia agrees that a canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by the Atroto River Valley route, or by any other route within its territory, shall not be constructed except with the assent, approval, and cooperation of the United States of America.

Colombia cedes to the United States of America the islands known as Providence and St. Andrew Islands, in the Caribbean Sea, and such contiguous islands as may be deemed by the United States and Colombia useful for the protection of the Panama Canal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the two articles offered as an amendment by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee propose the following amendment to the preamble: After the words "Government of the United States" strike out the words "is constructing" and insert in lieu thereof the words "has constructed."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the preamble reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This completes the committee amendments.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, if it is in order, I should like to offer a substitute for the preamble.

Mr. BORAH rose.

Mr. RANDELL. If the Senator from Idaho wishes to amend the preamble, I think he should have precedence.

Mr. BORAH. No; I simply desire to give notice that I reserve the right to offer in the Senate the amendment which I offered a few moments ago.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I give the same notice with reference to the amendment I offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that no notice is required.

Mr. RANDELL. I offer the substitute for the preamble which I send to the desk, and I ask to have it read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In lieu of the preamble as printed the Senator from Louisiana moves to insert the following:

A TREATY OF ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA.

The United States of America and the Republic of Colombia being desirous of reestablishing that ancient and cordial friendship which throughout the greater part of their history has characterized the relations between the two countries, and being convinced that the most potent assurance of peace and good feeling lies in that Christian amity which has hitherto attended their international association, have determined to enter into a treaty of alliance for protection and preservation of certain common interests and for the reestablishment and perpetuation of the friendship of the two countries. It being apparent that the objects so earnestly desired by both countries can not be attained by any system of reparations, and that firm friendship can not be established by insistence of either party upon acceptance by the other of their respective judgments as to the propriety of policy exercised from time to time by their respective administrations, and it being the desire of both countries that in a spirit of forbearance the past policies of both countries shall be left to the judgment of history, and it now being the ardent desire of both countries that they shall in a spirit of friendship and cooperation go forward to the greater accomplishment of their destinies under a beneficent Providence; in order, therefore, to conclude a treaty of alliance for mutual protection of common interests and in aid of a lasting understanding, the Government of the United States and the Government of Colombia have appointed as their plenipotentiaries—

Who after communicating to each other their respective full powers, which were found to be in due and proper form, have agreed upon the following:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the amendment to the preamble, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected, and the preamble was agreed to. The treaty was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BORAH. After the amendments are concurred in I desire to offer my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment should be offered before the amendments are concurred in.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. I offer the amendment, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the word "each" in the last line of Article II it is proposed to insert a semicolon and the following words:

that neither said payment nor anything contained in this treaty shall be taken or regarded as an admission that the secession of Panama in November, 1903, was in any way aided or abetted by the United States of America, its agents or representatives, or that said Government in any way violated its obligations to Colombia.

Mr. BORAH. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and, being taken, resulted—yeas 30, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Borah	Johnson	McNary	Townsend
Brandegge	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Wadsworth
Calder	Kellogg	Nelson	Watson, Ga.
Capper	Kendrick	Norbeck	Watson, Ind.
Cummins	Kenyon	Norris	Weller
Edge	Lenroot	Polindexter	Willis
Ernst	McCormick	Reed	
Hale	McCumber	Smoot	

NAYS—58.

Ashurst	Gooding	McLean	Smith
Ball	Harrel	Myers	Spencer
Broussard	Harris	New	Stanfield
Bursum	Harrison	Nicholson	Stanley
Cameron	Heflin	Oddie	Sterling
Colt	Hitchcock	Overman	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Swanson
Curtis	Keyes	Phipps	Trammell
Dillingham	King	Pittman	Underwood
Fernald	Knox	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Ladd	Ransdell	Warren
France	La Follette	Robinson	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Sheppard	Wolcott
Gerry	McKellar	Shorrbridge	
Glass	McKinley	Simmons	

NOT VOTING—8.

Caraway	Elkins	Owen	Shields
Dial	Newberry	Page	Walsh, Mont.

So Mr. BORAH's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The treaty is still in the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification, which the Secretary will read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty signed at Bogota April 6, 1914, between the United States and the Republic of Colombia, for the settlement of their differences arising out of the events which took place on the Isthmus of Panama in November, 1903, with the following amendments:

- (1) In the preamble strike out the words "is constructing" and insert in lieu thereof the words "has constructed."
- (2) Strike out all of Article I, which is in the following language:

"ARTICLE I.

"The Government of the United States of America, wishing to put at rest all controversies and differences with the Republic of Colombia arising out of the events from which the present situation on the Isthmus of Panama resulted, expresses, in its own name and in the name of the people of the United States, sincere regret that anything should have occurred to interrupt or to mar the relations of cordial friendship that had so long existed between the two nations.

"The Government of the Republic of Colombia, in its own name and in the name of the Colombian people, accepts this declaration in the full assurance that every obstacle to the restoration of complete harmony between the two countries will thus disappear."

- (3) Change the number of Article II to Article I.

(4) In the first paragraph of Article II, in the original text of the treaty, strike out the colon after the word "Railway" and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "the title to which is now vested entirely and absolutely in the United States of America, without any encumbrances or indemnities whatever."

(5) In clause 1 of Article II, in the original text of the treaty, strike out the following: "even in case of war between Colombia and another country."

(6) In clause 4 of Article II, in the original text of the treaty, strike out the words "during the construction of the interoceanic canal and afterwards whenever" and insert "whenever" in lieu thereof; strike out, after the word "shall," the following: "even in case of war between Colombia and another country"; and strike out the last sentence, which reads as follows: "The provisions of this paragraph shall not, however, apply in case of war between Colombia and Panama."

(7) In clause 5 of Article II, in the original text of the treaty, after the words "products of Colombia," insert "for Colombian consumption," after the words "vice versa, shall" insert a comma and the following: "whenever traffic by the canal is interrupted."

- (8) Change the number of Article III to Article II.

(9) In Article II of the original text of the treaty, before the words "United States of America," insert "Government of the"; after the word "pay" insert "at the city of Washington"; strike out, after the word "Colombia," the words "within six months after the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty"; strike out the period after

the word "money" and insert a comma in lieu thereof and add the following: "as follows: The sum of \$5,000,000 shall be paid within six months after the exchange of ratifications of the present treaty, and reckoning from the date of that payment the remaining \$20,000,000 shall be paid in four annual installments of \$5,000,000 each."

(10) Change the number of Article IV to Article III.

(11) Change the number of Article V to Article IV.

Resolved further, That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty signed by the plenipotentiaries of the United States and the Republic of Colombia on April 6, 1914, providing for the settlement of differences between the United States and the Republic of Colombia, with the understanding to be made a part of such treaty and ratification, that the provisions of section 1 of Article I of the treaty granting to the Republic of Colombia free passage through the Panama Canal for its troops, materials of war, and ships of war shall not apply in case of war between the Republic of Colombia and any other country.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, as the Secretary read the resolution of ratification I understood him to use the word "railway" instead of "railways," in line 2 of Article I. It is printed in the copy which I have in the plural, as "railways," and then there is a punctuation mark which apparently has been changed; I do not know what it is meant to represent now. I should like the Secretary to look in the resolution of ratification and see whether the word is in the plural or in the singular.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As printed it is in the singular.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. In the print which I have it is in the plural.

Mr. LODGE. That must be a printer's error, which ought to be corrected. I have not the original treaty here, but can send for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The word is in the singular in the print at the desk.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not know what the intention is, but I notice in a succeeding paragraph it refers to the "railway between Ancon and Cristobal or on any other railway substituted therefor"; so I did not know whether or not the plural was proper, whether it was intended to refer to all railroads that may be constructed; and I wondered whether the title "Panama Railway" was the corporate name of the company and whether it was "railway" or "railroad."

Mr. BORAH. I should think, Mr. President, it should be "railways," so that there will be nothing that escapes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In Article I it is "railway." The question is on the adoption of the resolution of ratification. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CUMMINS (when his name was called). Upon this question I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. If they were present, they would vote, as I am informed, for the ratification of the treaty. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. If they were present, they would vote "yea" and I should vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, it resulted—yeas 69, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—69.

Ashurst	Gerry	McKellar	Smoot
Ball	Glass	McKinley	Spencer
Brandegee	Gooding	McLean	Stanfield
Broussard	Hale	Moses	Stanley
Bursum	Harrell	Myers	Sterling
Calder	Harris	New	Sutherland
Cameron	Harrison	Nicholson	Swanson
Canaway	Heflin	Oddie	Underwood
Colt	Hitchcock	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Warren
Curtis	Kendrick	Phipps	Watson, Ind.
Dillingham	Keyes	Pittman	Weller
Edge	King	Pomerene	Williams
Ernst	Knox	Ransdell	Willis
Fernald	Ladd	Robinson	Wolcott
Fletcher	Lodge	Sheppard	
France	McCormick	Shortridge	
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Smith	

NAYS—19.

Borah	Kellogg	Nelson	Simmons
Capper	Kenyon	Norbeck	Townsend
Dial	La Follette	Norris	Wadsworth
Johnson	Lenroot	Poin Dexter	Watson, Ga.
Jones, Wash.	McNary	Reed	

NOT VOTING—8.

Cummins	Newberry	Page	Trammell
Elkins	Owen	Shields	Walsh, Mont.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question 69 Senators have voted in the affirmative and 19 in the negative. More than two-thirds of those present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution prevails.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I repeat the request which I made some little time ago for unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief extract from a letter of

Mr. Hay to Gen. Reyes, and another brief extract from a letter of Mr. Knox to Mr. Du Bois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have not understood the request.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is a request to print in the RECORD extracts from letters regarding the controversy out of which this treaty arose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Whose letters?

Mr. POINDEXTER. A letter from Secretary of State Hay and a letter from Secretary of State Knox.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From Senate document, vol. 15, No. 474, Diplomatic History of Panama Canal; 63d Cong., 2d sess., 1913-14, p. 502.—Mr. Hay to Gen. Reyes. Department of State, Washington, Jan. 5, 1904.]

"The United States has done more than this. It has assumed and discharged, as if primarily responsible, duties which in the first instance rested on Colombia. According to the language of the treaty, the right of the Government and people of the United States to a free and open transit across the Isthmus was guaranteed by New Granada; but the United States has been able to secure the benefits of it only by its own exertions; and in only one instance, and that as far back as 1857, has it been able to obtain from Colombia any compensation for the injuries and losses resulting from her failure to perform her obligation. The department deems it unnecessary now to enter into particulars, but is abundantly able to furnish them.

"Meanwhile, the great design of the treaty of 1846 remained unfulfilled; and in the end it became apparent, as has heretofore been shown, that it could be fulfilled only by the construction of a canal by the Government of the United States. By reason of the action of the Government at Bogota in repudiating the Hay-Herran convention, and of the views and intentions disclosed in connection with that repudiation, the Government was confronted, when the revolution at Panama took place, with the alternative of either abandoning the chief benefit which it expected and was entitled to derive from the treaty of 1846, or of resorting to measures the necessity of which it could contemplate only with regret.

"By the declaration of independence of the Republic of Panama a new situation was created. On the one hand stood the Government of Colombia invoking in the name of the treaty of 1846 the aid of this Government in its efforts to suppress the revolution; on the other hand stood the Republic of Panama that had come into being in order that the great design of that treaty might not be forever frustrated but might be fulfilled. The Isthmus was threatened with desolation by another civil war, nor were the rights and interests of the United States alone at stake; the interests of the whole civilized world were involved. The Republic of Panama stood for those interests; the Government of Colombia opposed them. Compelled to choose between these two alternatives, the Government of the United States, in no wise responsible for the situation that had arisen, did not hesitate. It recognized the independence of the Republic of Panama, and upon its judgment and action in the emergency the powers of the world have set the seal of their approval.

"In recognizing the independence of the Republic of Panama the United States necessarily assumed toward that Republic the obligations of the treaty of 1846. Intended, as the treaty was, to assure the protection of the sovereign of the Isthmus, whether the government of that sovereign ruled from Bogota or from Panama, the Republic of Panama, as the successor in sovereignty of Colombia, became entitled to the rights and subject to the obligations of the treaty.

"The treaty was one which in its nature survived the separation of Panama from Colombia. 'Treaties of alliance, of guarantee, or of commerce are not,' says Hall, 'binding upon a new State formed by separation'; but the new State 'is saddled with local obligations, such as that to regulate the channel of a river or to levy no more than certain dues along its course.' (International Law, 4th ed., p. 98.) To the same effect it is laid down by Rivier 'that treaties relating to boundaries, to watercourses, and to ways of communication' constitute obligations which are connected with the territory, and follow it through the mutations of national ownership. (Principes du Droit des Gens, I, 72-73.) This Government, therefore, does not perceive that in discharging in favor of the present sovereign of the Isthmus its duties under the treaty of 1846 it is in any way violating or failing in the performance of its legal duties.

"Under all the circumstances the department is unable to regard the complaints of Colombia against this Government, set forth in the 'Statement of grievances,' as having any valid foundation. The responsibility lies at Colombia's own door, rather than at that of the United States."

[From Document No. 1, 65th Congress, sp. sess.; Senate in executive session; p. 47. (9) Mr. Knox to Mr. Du Bois.]

"Before attempting to outline for your information the kind of proposals that this Government would entertain from the Government of Colombia, it will be well to emphasize here certain axiomatic rules which should guide you at every step in this mission.

"First of all, the Government of the United States will not for a moment consider the use of any language which would impugn in any way the past attitude, acts, or motives of the United States in connection with this matter.

"On his point I may call to your attention the language of the department's note to the Colombian minister, dated February 10, 1906, in which Mr. Root, then Secretary of State, said:

"The real gravamen of your complaint is this espousal of the cause of Panama by the people of the United States. No arbitration could deal with the real rights and wrongs of the parties concerned unless it were to pass upon the question whether the cause thus espoused was just—whether the people of Panama were exercising their just rights in declaring and maintaining their independence of Colombian rule. We assert and maintain the affirmative upon that question. We assert that the ancient State of Panama, independent in its origin and by nature and history a separate political community, was confederated with the other States of Colombia upon terms which preserved and continued its separate sovereignty; that it never surrendered that sovereignty; that in the year 1885 the compact which bound it to the other States of Colombia was broken and terminated by Colombia, and the Isthmus was subjugated by force; that it was held under foreign domination to which it had never consented; and that it was justly entitled to assert its sovereignty and demand its independence from a rule which was unlawful, oppressive, and tyrannical. We can not ask the people of Panama to consent that this right of theirs, which is vital to their political existence, shall be submitted to the decision of any arbitrator. Nor are we willing to permit any arbitrator to determine the political policy of the United States in following its sense of right and justice by espousing the cause of this weak people against the stronger Government of Colombia, which had so long held them in unlawful subjection.

"There is one other subject contained in your note which I can not permit to pass without notice. You repeat the charge that the Government of the United States took a collusive part in fomenting or inciting the uprising upon the Isthmus of Panama which ultimately resulted in the revolution. I regret that you should see fit to thus renew an aspersion upon the honor and good faith of the United States in the face of the positive and final denial of the fact contained in Mr. Hay's letter of January 5, 1904. You must be well aware that the universally recognized limitation upon the subjects proper for arbitration forbids that the United States should submit such a question to arbitration. In view of your own recognition of this established limitation, I have been unable to discover any justification for the renewal of this unfounded assertion."

"Again, you should at all times bear in mind the principle that the political acts of governments are in their very nature not justiciable."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the clerks to what I think is an obvious mistake in order to be sure that it is correct in the original text. On page 2, line 2 of the third section of Article I, the words "paper proof" occur. The words must be "proper proof," as stated in section 4, I think. I should like to have the clerks compare that with the original treaty. It will have to be compared with the original text. I think there must be a mistake. I ask unanimous consent that the clerks may be authorized to make the change to correspond.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the authorization will be given.

Mr. LODGE. I do not assert that it is not correct, but I want to have it examined and compared with the original treaty sent in by the President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will be done.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association at its annual convention held at Albuquerque, N. Mex., March 29, 1921, favoring the enactment of legislation for regulation of the packing industry, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of White City, Parkerville, Wilsey, Delavan, and Council Grove, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against any increase in tariff on coal-tar products used in the manufacture of dips and disinfectants by farmers and stock raisers, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the National Shippers and Consumers' Association, at Chicago, Ill., March 4, 1921, favoring an amendment of the transportation act in order that the law may be administered by the Labor Board so that wages shall be just and fair and the railroads shall not be compelled to pay more than will permit them, under economical management, to move traffic under just and reasonable rates to the farmers and stock raisers, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution of the Detroit Auto Dealers' Association, of Detroit, Mich., favoring legislation which will equalize marketing of salvaged equipment from the war area of Europe, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Melvin and Silverwood, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation increasing the tariff on coal-tar products used in the manufacture of dips and disinfectants by farmers and stock raisers, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of the Rotary Club, of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., favoring legislation to compel cessation of the persecution of the Jewish population in certain foreign countries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 1018) to amend an act entitled "An act to give indemnity for damages caused by American forces abroad," approved April 18, 1918;

A bill (S. 1019) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish free transportation and subsistence from Europe to the United States for certain destitute discharged soldiers and their wives and children;

A bill (S. 1020) for the relief of dependents of Lieuts. Jean Jagou and Fernand Herbert, French military mission to the United States; and

A bill (S. 1021) to provide for the exchange of Government lands for privately owned lands in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1022) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Elizabeth B. Eddy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1023) permitting certain employees of the Government to purchase supplies from the commissary stores of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1024) to provide for the storage of certain grain under Federal custody, the issue of receipts therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 1025) granting an increase of pension to Joana Boone (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1026) for the relief of Albert E. Magoffin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 1027) to quiet the title to certain lands in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 1028) for the relief of the widow and minor children of Gordon H. Meek, deceased; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1029) granting an increase of pension to James P. McClintock; and

A bill (S. 1030) granting a pension to Miller Kincaid; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) permitting Chinese to register under certain provisions and conditions; to the Committee on Immigration.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BALL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 54), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-seventh Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost of not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses

thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 5 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 21, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of April 18), 1921.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

George W. Aldridge, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y., in place of Byron R. Newton, resigned.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

John Foster Symes, of Colorado, to be United States attorney, district of Colorado. Mr. Symes is now serving in that position under appointment by court.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Albert B. White, of Parkersburg, W. Va., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of West Virginia in place of Samuel A. Hays.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

To be assistant surgeons.

Dr. Ralph D. Lille to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, to take effect from date of oath.

Dr. Thomas S. Love to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, to take effect from date of oath.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

To be majors with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Archie Wright Barry, Air Service.
Capt. George Cornelius Charlton, Infantry.
Capt. Charles Harrison Corlett, Infantry.
Capt. William Korst, Quartermaster Corps.
Capt. Robert Louis Moseley, Infantry.
Capt. George Horton Steel, Quartermaster Corps.
Capt. Harry Franklin Wilson, Finance Department.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Edward Cleveland Hagler, Medical Corps, from September 10, 1920.

First Lieut. Harry Gardner Johnson, Medical Corps, from February 27, 1921.

First Lieut. John Murray Welch, Medical Corps, from March 6, 1921.

First Lieut. John Adams Logan, Medical Corps, from March 11, 1921.

REAPPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

To be major with rank from April 13, 1921.

Herbert Spencer Struble, late captain, Field Artillery, Regular Army.

To be first lieutenant with rank from April 13, 1921.

John Michael Johnson, late first lieutenant, Field Artillery, Regular Army.

AIR SERVICE.

To be first lieutenant with rank from April 2, 1921.

Julian Buckner Haddon, late second lieutenant, Air Service, Regular Army.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

First Lieut. Deane Childs Howard, jr., Cavalry, with rank from September 20, 1919.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

First Lieut. John Joseph Breen, Infantry, with rank from October 30, 1919.

First Lieut. Kenneth Willey Leslie, Infantry, with rank from November 7, 1919.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

Maj. John Burhyte Wilmot Corey, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from May 15, 1917.

AIR SERVICE.

Capt. Harry Batten Flounders, Cavalry, with rank from October 12, 1917.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE.

Capt. Geoffrey Marshall, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

UNITED STATES NAVY.

Capt. Charles F. Hughes to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 11th day of February, 1921.

Commander Earl P. Jessop to be a captain in the Navy from the 8th day of December, 1920.

Commander Thomas C. Hart to be a captain in the Navy from the 7th day of February, 1921.

Commander Cyrus R. Miller to be a captain in the Navy from the 11th day of February, 1921.

Lieut. Commander Charles W. Densmore to be a commander in the Navy from the 23d day of November, 1919.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1921:

Robert A. Dawes.

Clyde S. McDowell.

Lieut. Louis H. Maxfield to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1921:

Frederic T. Van Auken.

Guy C. Barnes.

Laurance S. Stewart.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) George S. Gillespie to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1920:

Sherrod H. Quarles.

Thomas F. Downey.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Archie E. Glann.

Otto Nimitz.

Alan Barnett.

Elmer R. Henning.

Harold O. Hunter.

Theodore E. Chandler.

Allan R. Wurtele.

John L. McCrea.

John S. Farnsworth.

Albert R. Stephan.

Russell S. Berkey.

Willard A. Kitts, 3d.

Gail Morgan.

Van H. Ragsdale.

T. DeWitt Carr.

Sidney W. Kirtland.

Paul W. F. Huschke.

Donald B. Duncan.

William P. O. Clarke.

Robert C. Tobin.

Harold B. Sallada.

Collin DeV. Headlee.

Ralph Wyman.

Ben H. Wyatt.

Leonard P. Wessell.

Joseph H. Currier.

Thomas B. Inglis.

Daniel W. Tomlinson, 4th.

George C. Hawkins.

Roy T. Gallenmore.

Robert B. Parker.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 30th day of March, 1920:

John E. Ostrander, jr.

William P. O. Clarke.

Paul W. F. Huschke.

Acting Ensign Joseph H. Currier to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 26th day of May, 1920.

Ensign Otto Nimitz to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 5th day of June, 1918.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 29th day of June, 1920:

Thomas L. Sprague.

James D. Jacobs.

Clifton A. F. Sprague.

Herman E. Halland.

George G. Breed.

Gordon Rowe.

Christopher C. Miller.

Henry D. Stailey.

Olton R. Bennehoff.

William A. S. Macklin.

Thomas B. Inglis.

Daniel W. Tomlinson, 4th.

George C. Hawkins.
Roy T. Gallenmore.
Robert B. Parker.
Junius L. Cotten.
John W. Rowe.

The following-named acting ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Sidney B. Blaisdell.
Richard C. Bartlett.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Arthur S. Adams.
Thomas P. Jeter.
Harry R. Thurber.
Lyle N. Morgan.
Logan C. Ramsey.
Henry R. Herbst.
Charles L. Andrews, jr.
Charles J. Rend.
Marshall R. Greet.
Frank N. Sayre.
Paul D. Dingwell.
Carleton McGauly.
John R. Redman.

Guy D. Townsend.
George E. Ross, jr.
Thomas J. Haffey.
William K. Phillips.

William E. Hilbert.
Festus F. Foster.
James B. Sykes.
Douglas A. Powell.
William E. Clayton.
Bayard H. Colyear.
Walter D. Whitehead.
Robert L. Boller.
Paul H. Talbot.
John B. McDonald, jr.
James G. Atkins.
John L. Reynolds.
Herbert S. Woodman.

Asst. Surg. Joy A. Omer to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy with rank of lieutenant from the 22d day of April, 1918.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 6th day of June, 1920:

Brython P. Davis.
Donald H. O'Rourke.
Robert B. Miller.
Robert B. Team.
Ernest A. Daus.
Walter J. Spencer.

Paul T. Crosby.
Harold S. Sumerlin.
Leslie B. Marshall.
Lloyd B. Greene.
Claude K. Riney.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Nelson W. Sheley.
John H. Robbins.
Howard H. Montgomery.
Oscar Davis.
Charles P. Archambeault.
Anthony M. Menendez.
Rex H. White.

Carlton L. Andrus.
Edwin Peterson.
Joseph L. Schwartz.
Roger A. Nolan.
William H. Wynn.
George U. Pillmore.
Francis P. Gardner.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 30th day of March, 1921:

Ben Hollander, a citizen of California.
Joseph C. Flotte, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Asst. Paymaster Harry W. Rusk, jr., to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 5th day of June, 1917.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Ralph W. Swearingen.
Robert B. Huff.
Rufus B. Langsford.
James P. Jackson.

Malcolm G. Slarrow.
Michael J. Stubbs.
Phillip A. Caro.

Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, an additional number in grade, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 28th day of July, 1920.

Professor of Mathematics Theodore W. Johnson to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 28th day of July, 1920.

Naval Constructor George C. Westervelt to be a naval constructor in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 24th day of September, 1920.

The following-named naval constructors to be naval constructors in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 1st day of January, 1921:

Charles W. Fisher, jr.
Alexander H. VanKeuren.
Waldo P. Druley.

Holden C. Richardson.
Roy W. Ryden.
Herbert S. Howard.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 28th day of December, 1920:

John P. Millon.
Will S. Holloway.
Arthur A. F. Alm.

Harold J. Hill, a citizen of California, to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 2d day of April, 1921.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons, for temporary service, to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

John B. Bostick.
Bathune F. McDonald.

James K. Gordon.
Frederick N. Pugsley.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Walter P. Dey.
Richard W. Hughes.
John T. O'Connell.
Henry DeW. Hubbard.

Preston A. McLendon.
Melvin S. Stover.
Harrison L. Wyatt.

Passed Asst. Dental Surg. Thomas White, for temporary service, to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

The following-named passed assistant dental surgeons of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Fred A. Batkin.
Patrick A. McCole.
Frederick W. Mitchell.

Chaplain Herbert Dumstrete to be a chaplain in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 3d day of November, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

The following-named chaplains, for temporary service, to be chaplains in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 3d day of November, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Harrill S. Dyer.
Allison J. Hayes.
Albert N. Park, jr.
George S. Rentz.
Bart D. Stephens.

Charles V. Ellis.
Clinton A. Neyman.
Harry M. Peterson.
Reuben W. Shrum.
William N. Thomas.

The following-named chaplains of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be chaplains in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 3d day of November, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

James S. Day.
William P. Williams.

The following-named chaplains, for temporary service, to be chaplains in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 3d day of November, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

John H. S. Putnam.
John H. Hyde.
Lewis D. Gottschall.

William T. Holt.
Roman M. Peil.

Chaplain Alfred de Groot Vogler, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be a chaplain in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 3d day of November, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

The following-named officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Edward H. Sparkman, jr.
Elwin C. Taylor.

MARINE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants from June 4, 1920.

Leonard E. Rea.
Rees Skinner.
Arthur F. Sennholtz.

To be second lieutenants from June 4, 1920.

Howard N. Feist.
Edwin U. Hakala.
Irving G. Hamilton.
Max D. Smith.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of April 18), 1921.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

William D. Riter.

FIRST ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Edward C. Finney, of Kansas.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

William Spry, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICE.

Spencer E. Burroughs, of California, at Susanville, Calif.
Alfred M. Bergere, of New Mexico, at Santa Fe, N. Mex.
James Frederick Drake, of Pueblo, Colo., at Pueblo, Colo.
Charles D. Voris, of Monte Vista, Colo., at Del Norte, Colo.
Joseph Montgomery, of Lewistown, Mont., at Lewistown, Mont.
Albert Halen, of Vernal, Utah, at Vernal, Utah.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

William Ashley, of Sandpoint, Idaho, at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.
Mrs. Caroline S. King, of Minnesota, at Cass Lake, Minn.
William O. Ligon, of Gloster, Miss., at Jackson, Miss.
Roy Henry Fuller, of Havre, Mont., at Havre, Mont.
Harry R. Grier, of Tonopah, Nev., at Carson City, Nev.
Mrs. Addie Longhurst, of Vernal, Utah, at Vernal, Utah.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 20, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, at the front door of Thy Holy Bible Thou hath said, "In the beginning, God." This is the most majestic word ever uttered. At the call of this day give unto us a realization of Thy presence, and crown our labors with richest success, which is achievement, and make goodness and gratitude be the flowers of our daily conduct. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE TO WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS AND RECESSES.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask the consideration of the following privileged resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks for the consideration of a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 40.

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized to sit during the sessions and recesses of the present Congress; to employ such expert, clerical, and stenographic services, and to gather such information, through Government agents or otherwise, as to it may seem fit, in connection with the consideration and preparation of bills for the revision of the present tariff law and of other revenue legislation; to purchase such books and to have such printing and binding done as it shall require, in addition to requiring the attendance of the committee stenographers; and to incur such other expenses as may be deemed necessary by the committee. All expenses of the committee incurred for any such purposes shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on the usual vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the Committee on Accounts.

With committee amendments, as follows:

On line 14, page 1, strike out the word "approved" and insert in lieu thereof the word "submitted," and in line 15, strike out the words "the chairman of the" and insert "approved by the."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the effect of the amendments?

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the Clerk please read the resolution again as amended—that clause?

The Clerk read as follows:

So that the resolution will read, as amended, "All expenses of the committee incurred for any such purpose shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on the usual vouchers submitted by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on Accounts."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. I notice that the resolution provides that the committee may employ experts to gather statistics and

information. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that our Tariff Commission, which sits at a great expense to the Government, is able to furnish all information, or if it is not, it should be able to furnish all information—such information as the committee might want to acquire through the employment of experts?

Mr. IRELAND. Well, the gentleman might better direct that inquiry to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, does not that feature of the resolution appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. IRELAND. I am not offering any opinion on that. It is a matter resting with the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will realize that there are lines of inquiry which the committee should enter into and take up which are not necessarily taken up by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Wyoming realizes that he can call on that Tariff Commission chairman this morning for definite information on any particular item that is concerned with the tariff, and he can get that information within a very reasonable time.

Mr. MONDELL. And as far as they have investigated the matter, and in so far as they have the facts—and they have investigated many matters quite thoroughly—the information will be promptly forthcoming. But that commission can not cover all the fields of information.

Mr. BLANTON. My inquiry was just along the line of duplication of effort which we have been trying to stop here, and which we had hopes we would stop when our distinguished friends got into power.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This resolution, as well as I can tell from memory, is similar to the resolutions that have been passed here before?

Mr. IRELAND. It is almost identical.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Except as to the matter of how the accounts shall be approved, it is without change?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is a little more strict, a little more hedged about, than the resolutions that have been passed before, I will say to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. How is it hedged differently?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the resolutions that have been passed before did not have that last provision with reference to the approval by the Committee on Accounts, although it was perhaps understood that that would be done.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I referred to that in my statement.

Mr. IRELAND. Whether or not it is so stated, that would be a necessity.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CLERKS TO COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the consideration of the further resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 22.

Resolved, That the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States is hereby authorized to employ competent persons to assist in compiling, codifying, and revising the laws and treaties of the United States under the direction and supervision of the committee and the chairman thereof; that the persons so employed shall be known as revisers and assistants; and that the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to pay to the said persons from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives the amounts designated for each by the chairman of said committee upon vouchers by the said chairman, not to exceed the sum of \$5,000 per annum until otherwise provided, beginning March 4, 1921.

With a committee amendment as follows:

After the word "chairman," in line 12, insert "and approved by the Committee on Accounts," so that the resolution will read: "That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to pay to said persons from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives the amounts designated for each by the chairman of said committee upon vouchers by the said chairman, not to exceed the sum of \$5,000 per annum until otherwise provided, beginning March 4, 1921."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman asking unanimous consent for the consideration of that resolution?

Mr. IRELAND. No; it is not necessary. It is a privileged resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is a privileged resolution?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, does the gentleman intend to make a statement about the matter?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes; but I will answer the gentleman's inquiry first.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering what the necessity is for this resolution at this time. At the last session of the last Congress the House passed the completed work of this committee. The Senate did not pass it. Is there any reason why to-day or to-morrow that committee can not report that same proposition which we passed here by unanimous consent, practically, without reading?

Mr. IRELAND. With very few additions, I think that is possible. This is the situation as it has been given to me by the chairman of that committee: You will recall that last session we appropriated \$9,000 additional for this work. They turned back into the contingent fund about \$3,200 out of that appropriation. The chairman of the committee assures the Committee on Accounts that it is necessary to make certain corrections in the bill that he presented at the last session before presenting it again. I do not know how much that will amount to. The corrections are largely of clerical and typographical errors, but will require considerable work. There may be some slight additions to be made, and there is an index to be compiled as well. The chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws has been so economical in his work heretofore that he has gained our confidence, and we did not think this amount unreasonable; and in view of what was done in the last session I think we may expect that he will save a considerable sum out of it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my inquiry certainly carries no thought of reflection upon the chairman of the committee.

Mr. IRELAND. I did not mean to intimate that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But here is what I fear about this matter. There was a completed work that we passed four or five months ago. Now, why not pass that at once in the same way that we passed it then? I think there will be no objection. If this authorization is given to employ these revisers, the work of revision having been brought up to date in the bill presented by the chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws in the last Congress, the state of business will become such here that probably it will go on during this Congress and come up at the last of the short session. I should like to see the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] bring in the same bill that he brought in before, and secure its passage now in these early days of the session and cut off all these employees.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] labors under a misapprehension as to the work of this committee, and that is surprising to me in view of his always accurate recollection. This resolution is, in effect, the same one that has been in force for a great many years.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There has been a necessity for it for a great many years, but I do not see the necessity now.

Mr. LITTLE. I think I can explain that to the satisfaction of the gentleman. For the last seven years there has been what was considered and was a continuing resolution, adopted in 1914, allowing the sum of \$4,000 per annum for revision. Revision does not necessarily mean an overhauling of the entire code, and it has not been so held for many years. I am informed by my predecessor that prior to the administration of the House in 1912 the allowance was \$5,000 a year for a reviser of the statutes. A reviser was employed first at \$5,000 and then at \$4,000 by what was considered a continuing resolution. For many years they never attempted to do such work as the committee did in the last Congress. They would pick out one subject, like the Judicial Code or the Penal Code, or interstate commerce, and revise it and bring it before the House, and many bills have passed the House in that way—the Penal Code, the Judicial Code, and the interstate commerce law, and some were passed by both Houses. The work of this committee for many years was to take up the laws, subject by subject, and revise them and bring in separate bills of a revisionary character. I thought it was best not to try to make so many bites of a cherry, but to compile one great code and get it all up, and the House was good

enough to pass it. It will be presented very soon, and as soon as our committee is able to bring it out I think we can bring in a report, and I hope to have it passed promptly; but still, the gentleman must remember that that will only bring us down to the Sixty-sixth Congress. We are two years behind now. At the end of this Congress we will be four years behind. My own theory is that from now on we ought to be able to keep the revision up to date, or nearly so, so that there always shall be a complete edition and that we shall never be more than one Congress behind. Having the work of so many years now brought so nearly up to date, it is not going to be so hard next time. But by the end of this Congress we will have the work of two Congresses to bring up. Besides codifying the laws, this committee, in the Sixty-sixth Congress, discovered errors in the appropriations for one department by which discovery enough money was saved to pay all the expenses of this legislation and make the Government a net gain of \$250,000. We have already saved the money we are asking for.

But that is not all. Not only do we have to keep the Revised Statutes up to date, but we have to follow it up. I have not in mind any particular thing that we want to revise.

What we have done has been to make a codification. Heretofore, when they brought up the Judicial Code, this committee reported that bill which did away with the circuit judges. I wish to suggest another thing, and I think this will specifically answer the gentleman's question. It is our duty to revise the statutes of the District of Columbia. In 1874, when the Revised Statutes of the United States were passed by Congress, that work was accompanied contemporaneously by a revision of the statutes of the District of Columbia. Then the District Code was passed, but since that time there have been a great many amendments to it. The work of our committee in the last Congress was so extensive that we could not contemporaneously bring up the codification of the laws of the District, and it is the purpose of the committee now to bring together a revision of all the laws relating to the District of Columbia.

We have considered various other projects; for example, a codification of the laws of the Territories and of our insular possessions. Then we hope, possibly before this Congress finishes its work, to present a codification of the treaties in such shape as to put them all into one volume, so that by the end of this Congress we will have not only this code but a revised statutes of the District of Columbia—not done since 1874—and possibly of the treaties. Under the rules this also is the work of our committee, and I propose now, if I have the approval of the House, to do what has not been done for 47 years, in addition to the codification of all the general laws, which our committee did in the Sixty-sixth Congress.

This resolution is practically the same as the one adopted for a good many years, and it provides for revision, just as they revised the laws for many years. A similar one was in force in the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-fifth, Sixty-fourth, and I do not know how many more.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it looks to me as though this is simply a resolution to authorize the continuance of an employment the present necessity for which is not clearly evident.

Mr. LITTLE. I want to do just what the committee did in the Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, and Sixty-fifth Congresses under the former Democratic majority here. This is just such a resolution in effect as they adopted, and, having now disposed of the great work of general codification, we propose to do what is necessary to do in order to keep these things up to date.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The big proposition was then involved of the work upon which the revisers were supposed to be engaged.

Mr. LITTLE. They never attempted it for 47 years, and did not do what we did in the last Congress. They gave attention to various laws, one at a time, except, of course, when a commission spent \$180,000, and from 1897 to 1906, to prepare a Revised Statutes.

Mr. GARNER. I hope the gentleman does not limit his activities to what happened in the Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, and Sixty-fifth Congresses. If he does I shall certainly vote against this resolution, because we appropriated \$4,000 a year during those Congresses and accomplished nothing, and there is no reason why we should keep up that process.

But I want to say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] that his work has been remarkable, and I think he should be commended for it. I am in hearty accord with what he hopes to accomplish, and I hope that at as early a date as possible he will bring in his code and get it passed and send it over to the Senate, and see if they can get some action on it there.

Mr. LITTLE. We are making a few changes, typographical and otherwise, and as soon as the printer gets it done I shall call the committee together.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUSTED. Some time ago my attention was called by the librarian of the Bar Association to the fact that certain executive orders in certain countries had the force of law, and that they have never been published. I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to that fact and suggest that those be published because they are law and it is necessary that the American lawyers who wish to consult them should have a place where they are available.

Mr. LITTLE. I am obliged to the gentleman for reminding me of that fact.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

Mr. LITTLE. The committee has had that under consideration, but those are not statutes and we can not codify them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the regular order. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the resolution as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee) there were 136 ayes and 61 noes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and fifteen Members are present, a quorum, and the resolution is agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Cravens, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint an additional member of the Joint Committee on Reorganization, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

ATTENDANT FOR LADIES' RECEPTION ROOM.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 44.

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint an attendant for the ladies' reception room of the House of Representatives during the Sixty-seventh Congress, at the rate of \$100 per month, beginning on the 11th day of April, 1921, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution, identical with that adopted at the last session, and is to continue the appointment of the person named.

The resolution was agreed to.

CANCELLATION STAMPS, CHICAGO POST OFFICE.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2185) providing for a "Pageant of Progress Exposition" cancellation stamp to be used by the Chicago post office.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to furnish to and direct the use of cancellation stamps by the Chicago post office, bearing the following words: "Pageant of Progress Exposition, Chicago, July 30 to August 14, 1921."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to permit the use in the Chicago post office of special canceling stamps bearing the following words and figures: 'Pageant of Progress Exposition, Chicago, July 30 to August 14, 1921.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if the Post Office Department has not authority to permit the use of this stamp?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; but the requests for this privilege became so numerous that the department in 1901 found it necessary to issue the following order:

It is hereby ordered that post-marking dies shall not be used for advertising purposes except upon special permission from the Post Office Department, application for which should be made to the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, and which will not be granted unless it be for some national purpose for which Congress shall have made an appropriation.

The "Pageant of Progress Exposition" at Chicago, while of national importance, fails to come within the exception. Hence the department could not consistently grant the request, and it became necessary for Congress to do so. We passed a similar bill in the last Congress in behalf of the Roosevelt Memorial

Association. The bill as amended will not put any expense on the Government, for the cost of the dies will be paid for by the exposition.

Mr. WALSH. If it is discontinued under Executive order, why does not the committee report a general authority?

Mr. STEENERSON. We did not think it would be advisable. The department has made an exhaustive report on the subject, and we thought we would leave it to the wise discretion of Congress to determine in what cases permission for cancellation stamps could be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 56.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 2, entitled "A bill to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States." That there shall be not to exceed four hours of general debate, the time to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the bill. That after general debate the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule. That upon the completion of such consideration the committee shall automatically rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments thereto, if any. Whereupon, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except only the motion to recommit.

The following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "H. R. 2" and insert "H. R. 4075."

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition to take the time of the House in discussing this resolution. The subject matter was discussed in the last Congress at length and in many other Congresses. A bill passed the House in the last Congress and another bill on the same subject passed the Senate. A conference agreed upon a bill which was sent to the President. There the bill failed. This matter comes up thus early in this session because of the failure to enact a law in the last Congress. Four hours of general debate is provided under the rule. It is thought that in that time the House will be fully advised as to the provisions of the bill, the difference between this bill and the bill which passed the House in the last session, and whatever differences there may be between this bill and the conference bill as agreed to.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. It occurs to me that the gentleman from Kansas might occupy five minutes of his time in enlightening the new Members of Congress why it is necessary to have a special rule in order to consider this legislation, and explain to them whether or not it is the beginning of legislating in this House under a special rule, or if it is expected to pass the Republican program under the general rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the very ingenious gentleman from Texas is never at a loss. On this occasion, however, I have no difficulty in answering his question. This ordinarily is Calendar Wednesday. It was desired to call the bill up to-day. Calendar Wednesday business has been set aside. Under the business in order on Calendar Wednesday the bill could have been called up on the call of the calendar, and under the rules of the House we would have had two hours of general debate. Then the bill would have been uncompleted and it would have gone over until next Wednesday. It is desired to have the bill taken up to-day under a rule, to have general debate for four hours, and pass the bill probably to-morrow or the next day.

Mr. GARNER. To-day is not Calendar Wednesday. Calendar Wednesday has been set aside. Under the rules of the House the gentleman from Washington could have called the bill up under a call of the calendar. Why not consider this bill under the general rules of the House?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Because he thought it proper to consider it in this way. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. That answers the question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from Texas is insinuating that it is the purpose of the majority of this House to pass all of its program under a special rule. I suggest that the gentleman from Kansas point out to the gentleman from Texas the fact that we passed a very important part of our program the other day, a tariff bill and an antidumping bill, without any special rule whatever.

Mr. GARNER. Yes; and I want to commend the Republicans for doing that, and I want them to keep up the good work. It seems to me that now you have no good reason for changing that good resolution.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman from Kansas think it might be a very good time to demonstrate to the gentleman from Texas and the other new leaders on that side of the House what we can do if we want to? [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. There is no doubt about what you can do when you want to do it.

Mr. MANN. And we are going to do it.

Mr. GARNER. You have the might, and of course that makes the right, according to your philosophy.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. We thought it proper to show to the country that we could pass an immigration bill through this House in about eight hours.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman has stated that, and since the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said it is well to show what the Republicans can do when they desire to do it, let me ask the gentleman from Kansas if it is not a fact that this particular bill, like the tariff feature of the revenue bill which was passed a few days ago, has been ordered passed by the Senate, and if they have not said to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] and to the organization upon the Republican side of the House, "Sign upon the dotted line"? Else why is it that the gentleman from Washington did not bring in the bill under the general rules of the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman want an answer to that?

Mr. MANN. The practice to which the gentleman from Tennessee refers has not prevailed since the incumbency of the last President, and when the Democrats were in the majority in Congress.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman from Tennessee puts that as an inquiry, and if he wants an answer, I would say to the gentleman that nothing of the sort has occurred.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is rather surprising in view of the attitude taken on the tariff question.

Mr. MONDELL. That is the gentleman's theory of the attitude we took on tariff legislation, and he is probably just as wrong about that as he is about this.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, I do not want to get the gentleman into a quarrel with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kansas yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] indicated that it was not necessary to have a rule to pass the emergency tariff bill. He forgot to state at that time that the tariff bill is in a class by itself under special rules of the House, and that not a single new item, for instance, such as hides, could be offered to it without its being out of order. The tariff bill was in a class by itself, and therefore was in the nature of being passed under a special rule.

Mr. CARTER. At least under a special order.

Mr. BLANTON. Under a special order of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I see no particular reason for considering this bill under a special rule, and yet being heartily in favor of the bill, I shall not oppose the adoption of the rule. Just why it became necessary to provide for the consideration of the bill in this way has not very definitely appeared. Being heartily in favor of the bill, I shall not oppose the adoption of the rule. I reserve the remainder of my time and now yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise with the greatest respect possible for the conventionalities of the House, one of which is that a new Member should be seen and not heard, as far as possible, until his convictions shall be seriously opposed and he shall see practically irresistible reasons why he shall speak. It is especially becoming that he shall receive counsel and not assume to instruct; but as a Representative of the new membership of this body, I feel greatly surprised that

this particular measure should be, as it seems to me about to be, railroaded through the House. The word is most respectfully used. I recognize the custom and the right and probably the wisdom of the custom so to conduct strictly partisan measures. I came from the people knowing that the Republican caucus would rush through this emergency tariff bill. It is a political measure, and rapidity of action is demanded by the interests which the Republicans represent, as they see it, and important as it was and as anxious as I was to put upon record my objections to it, I entered them not then, nor do I propose to enter them now, because politics must have its way, whether right or wrong.

If this particular bill is to be taken up under a special order, instead of under the general rules of the House, I ask the new membership of the House, how they are to ever know what is being passed and what is the duty they owe to the country, except by following their leaders, if there be any on this non-partisan question. As I understand it, the doctrine of arbitrarily following leadership is getting a little taboo in this country just now, and probably ought to be. I have had opportunity to read to the middle of the second page of this great measure. I feel my constituents are intensely interested in it. Usually I shall be found following the lead of the gentleman on my right, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU], but I am not committed to his leadership here, and it does not become me to follow his leadership or any other partisan leadership on this question, for in no respect does it partake of politics. I know there are vastly different views on my side of the Continent from those held upon the western side of the Continent upon the great question of immigration, which touches the economic life of that country most vitally.

But I have only been able to read to the middle of the second page. How am I to get information upon this important question if four hours of debate are to be allowed only, and that debate properly assigned to those most experienced in this body—members of the higher committees and leaders of the caucus? If I am to get it, I must go over into a committee of which I am not a member or into the Republican caucus, if it is or was there considered, and in that presence I would be decidedly contraband. I would be entirely out of place. Speaking politically, and I assure you I am not speaking personally, I would be quite as much out of place as a vestal virgin in a Turkish harem. [Laughter.] But permit me to say that is purely political and not personal. I have viewed the present Republican side of this House with much admiration. I have looked upon their faces, looming with intelligence and beaming with the qualities of strong Americanism. [Applause.] And especially have I noticed and been impressed with the evidence of the magnificent mentality and qualities of strong analytical power, discrimination, and logic in the trained mind of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] [applause on the Republican side], but, as a lawyer, as a man capable of appreciating those qualities of mentality and of manhood, I address my remarks to him and appeal to such a mentality as that: Why I, as a Member, shall not have at least opportunity to read a bill of indictment before I know what the defendant is indicted for—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POU. I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. At least to read the complaint before I assume to know what the plaintiff's cause of action is. I appeal to the gentlemen in charge of this bill for some intelligent, satisfactory explanation of why this haste. Now, gentlemen, I come from a school of political education which instructed me that this House of Congress was a great body of deliberation, the popular branch of the National Legislature; that it was here where the popular sentiment of this Nation was voiced by debate, by exchange of views, yet I heard it said on the floor of this House during the consideration of the emergency tariff bill that it was expected that the Senate would give the necessary time to that measure, so I presume the policy is to be adopted that it shall be in the other end of the Capitol where consideration shall be given to this and similar measures, and this great, popular branch of the National Legislature shall be no more than a suggestive body, and send these great measures over where debate is not so limited, making of the Senate not what it was intended by the fathers of the Government to be, a representative of the States, but making it a great, popular body, where measures are considered, and this House merely an inquisition. Most respectfully, gentlemen, do I as a young Member protest against the consideration of this bill under this special rule, for the reason that it seems to me that it is not demanded, especially considering the fact that you are not yet hurried; business has not yet accumulated on your calendar, and

there is no demand for a drive nor for a rush. Let us take it along easier, more slowly, and intelligently. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, before giving my objections why this resolution should not be adopted I can not help from extending my appreciation to the membership of this House for the courtesy extended by electing me on the two committees to which I was designated by the minority, as otherwise I know I would have been precluded from giving expression to my views on the immigration question.

Mr. Speaker, I have at all times opposed legislation by special rule. Like the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARD], I do not see any reason for this haste. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] states that this measure was considered in the last Congress and passed by a large majority, and therefore there is no need for us to waste a great deal of time in its consideration. I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the reasons that were assigned in the last session do not now exist. They did not exist then, and they do not exist now. At that time gentlemen who had demanded haste for the passage of this legislation were fearful that within three or four months millions of immigrants who were declared to be undesirable would be flooding our country. To-day, I am sure, after three months have passed, that in justice to themselves they can not again make the same charges and sway the House in favor of this legislation. Instead of these millions, whom you feared, only a small number did enter the United States this year. For that reason I feel it is not necessary to rush this legislation, and the Members at this time should have a chance to consider the provisions of this bill. You have no bills ready, and will not have any to-morrow or the day after, so why not afford opportunity to the new Members, yes, and some of the old Members, to familiarize themselves with the provisions of the bill. I believe if the membership of this House would thoroughly acquaint themselves with all its unjustifiable provisions that many who voted for the bill heretofore and many of those who intend to vote for it would hesitate before they would cast their vote for it. I think this legislation should not be considered so hastily. It is important legislation, and due consideration should be given it, and it is for that reason I feel a special rule should not be adopted.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I will.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is this the same identical bill passed by this Congress, adopted by the conference committee, and vetoed by the President?

Mr. SABATH. In the main, yes. The committee has adopted several amendments which, however, are not of great importance.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4075.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4075) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, with Mr. STAFFORD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4075) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act—

The term "United States" means the United States and any waters, territory, or other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof except the Isthmian Canal Zone and the Philippine Islands; but if any alien leaves the Canal Zone or any insular possession of the United States and attempts to enter any other place under the jurisdiction of the United States nothing contained in this act shall be construed as permitting him to enter under any other conditions than those applicable to all aliens.

The word "alien" includes any person not a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, but this definition shall not be held to include Indians of the United States not taxed nor citizens of the islands under the jurisdiction of the United States.

The term "immigration act" means the act of February 5, 1917, entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States"; and the term "immigration laws" includes such act and all laws, conventions, and treaties of the United States relating to the immigration, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens.

SEC. 2. (a) That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910. This provision shall not apply to the following, and they shall not be counted in reckoning any of the percentage limits provided in this act: (1) Government officials, their families, attendants, servants, and employees; (2) aliens residing in the United States who return from a temporary visit abroad; (3) aliens in continuous transit through the United States; (4) aliens lawfully admitted to the United States who later go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory; (5) aliens visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for business or pleasure; (6) aliens from countries immigration from which is regulated in accordance with treaties or agreements relating solely to immigration; (7) aliens from the so-called Asiatic barred zone, as described in section 3 of the immigration act; (8) aliens who have resided continuously for at least one year immediately preceding the time of their admission to the United States in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Mexico, countries of Central or South America, or adjacent islands; or (9) aliens entitled to readmission to the United States under the provisions of the joint resolution entitled, "Joint resolution authorizing the readmission to the United States of certain aliens who have been conscripted or have volunteered for service with the military forces of the United States or cobelligerent forces," approved October 19, 1918.

(b) For the purposes of this act nationality shall be determined by country of birth, treating as separate countries the colonies or dependencies for which separate enumeration was made in the United States census of 1910.

(c) The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, jointly, shall, as soon as feasible after the passage of this act, prepare a statement showing the number of persons of the various nationalities resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910, which statement shall be the population basis for the purposes of this act. In case of changes in political boundaries in foreign countries occurring subsequent to 1910 and resulting (1) in the creation of new countries, the Governments of which are recognized by the United States, or (2) in the transfer of territory from one country to another, such transfer being recognized by the United States, such officials, jointly, shall estimate the number of persons resident in the United States in 1910 who were born within the area included in such new countries or in such territory so transferred, and revise the population basis as to each country involved in such change of political boundary. For the purposes of such revision and for the purposes of this act generally aliens born in the area included in any such new country shall be considered as having been born in such country, and aliens born in any territory so transferred shall be considered as having been born in the country to which such territory was transferred.

(d) When the maximum number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any fiscal year under this act shall have been admitted all other aliens of such nationality, except as otherwise provided in this act, who may apply for admission during the same fiscal year shall be excluded: *Provided*, That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any month shall not exceed 20 per cent of the total number of aliens of such nationality who are admissible in that fiscal year: *Provided further*, That aliens who are professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, nurses, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, aliens belonging to any recognized learned profession, or aliens employed as domestic servants, may if otherwise admissible be admitted notwithstanding the maximum number of aliens of the same nationality admissible in the same month or fiscal year, as the case may be, shall have entered the United States; but aliens of the classes included in this proviso who enter the United States before such maximum number shall have entered shall (unless visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for business or pleasure) be counted in reckoning the percentage limits provided in this act: *Provided further*, That in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given so far as possible to the parents and minor children of citizens of the United States, and to the parents, wives, and minor children of aliens who are now in the United States and have applied for citizenship in the manner provided by law.

SEC. 3. That the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall, as soon as feasible after the passage of this act and from time to time thereafter, prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry the provisions of this act into effect. He shall, as soon as feasible after the passage of this act, publish a statement showing the number of aliens of the various nationalities who may be admitted to the United States between May 10, 1921, and the end of the current fiscal year, and on June 30 thereafter he shall publish a statement showing the number of aliens of the various nationalities who may be admitted during the ensuing fiscal year. He shall also publish monthly statements during the time this act remains in force showing the number of aliens of each nationality already admitted during the then current fiscal year and the number who may be admitted under the provisions of this act during the remainder of such year, but when 75 per cent of the maximum number of any nationality admissible during the fiscal year shall have been admitted such statements shall be issued weekly thereafter. All statements shall be made available for general publication and shall be mailed to all transportation companies bringing aliens to the United States who shall request the same and shall file with the Department of Labor the address to which such statements shall be sent. The Secretary of Labor shall also submit such statements to the Secretary of State, who shall transmit the information contained therein to the proper diplomatic and consular officials of the United States, which officials shall make the same available to persons intending to emigrate to the United States and to others who may apply.

SEC. 4. That the provisions of this act are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws.

SEC. 5. That this act shall take effect and be enforced on and after May 10, 1921 (except sections 1 and 3 and subdivision (c) of section 2, which shall take effect immediately upon the passage of this act), and shall continue in force until June 30, 1922, and the number of aliens

of any nationality who may be admitted during the time between May 10, 1921, and the close of the current fiscal year shall be limited to one-sixth of the number who are admissible annually as provided in section 2 of this act.

During the reading of the bill the following occurred:

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, this is a short bill and will take only about five minutes to read. I think we ought to have it read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Also the following committee amendments were read:

Page 3, line 14, after the word "islands," strike out the word "or." Page 3, line 20, after the figures "1918," strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "or (10) aliens who prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or of the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence, whether such persecution is evidenced by overt acts or by laws or governmental regulations that discriminate against the alien or the race to which he belongs because of his religious faith."

Pages 5 and 6, in line 24, strike out "visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for business or pleasure" and insert in lieu thereof the words "excluded by subdivision (a) from being counted." Page 7, line 20, strike out the word "subdivision" and insert in lieu thereof the words "subdivisions (b) and."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, an understanding has been reached among the members of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization that this four hours of general debate is to be divided into quarters, one-fourth of the time to be controlled by myself, on the majority side, for the bill; one-fourth by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], on the minority side, for the bill; one-fourth by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL], on this side, against the bill; and one-fourth by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], on the other side, against the bill, making a fair distribution for both sides of the question and for both parties. The division is not on party lines.

Mr. RAKER. That will be satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will respect the wishes as stated by the gentleman from Washington, and will now recognize him for one hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, a little more than four years ago the Congress of the United States, in extraordinary session, by solemn vote declared the entrance of the United States into the World War. The fourth anniversary of that momentous event occurred but a couple of weeks ago, and on the day of that anniversary I was here in the city of Washington awaiting the assembling of this extraordinary session of Congress. I reflected on the assembling of that extraordinary session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, with its many new Members, for the purpose of making that declaration of war. I reflected how hard was the first vote of those new Members. I ran over the four years that have passed since that entry of the United States into the great World War and reviewed the world events in which the United States had participated. I thought of the many war laws, the things done, the things to be undone.

I contemplated the debts to be paid. I tried to think of the burdens placed not only upon this generation but the next generation—all for our country's good and our country's honor—and I could not help but think, my friends, that our children's children may not live to see the settlement of the problems brought about through our entry into the World War. Members of Congress knew then, as Members of Congress know now, that the first duty of an American Congressman is to his own country, the United States of America. [Applause.]

Then I fell to thinking about all of the attempts that have been made to restrict immigration, running for these many years past. I remembered how, shortly after the armistice, more than two years ago, our late lamented friend from Alabama, John L. Burnett, who was then chairman of the committee, introduced a bill suspending immigration, containing certain exemptions. That bill was debated and discussed in the committee, reported out, and took its place on the calendar. But it could not be acted upon for want of time. And in the last Congress numerous bills were introduced to restrict or suspend immigration. And I reviewed the action of the last House of Representatives which by an overwhelming vote passed that

bill, the action of the other body of the Congress in passing a substitute bill after long hearings, the action in conference, and the final sending of the bill to the President a few days before the final adjournment of the Congress, his failure to act, and the death of the bill. I saw the forces in opposition then; I see them now. And now to-day, ready as a new Congress to leap into action, we are met here with the statement that we need more time; that there must be more discussion, must be more hearings; that gentlemen have not time to consider a problem which, my friends, whatever way you may decide it finally, is so important that it will affect this generation of the people of the United States, their children and their children's children, as much as any legislation which can be placed upon the statute books.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will ask the gentleman to excuse me for a few moments.

Much consideration has been given to the measure now placed before you. I hope Members, and particularly the new Members, who come here desiring to pitch into the work of the Congress of the United States, will realize what the passage of such a bill will mean to the Government of the United States in the future. I hope the new Members will come to a quick knowledge of why delays occur in the attempt to pass legislation of this kind, why it is that committees act slowly; then they can tell their constituents why we have been all these years engaged in an effort to slow down the streams of immigration from other countries into the United States.

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask not to be interrupted just now. In a few minutes I will yield.

I ask the Members to study carefully the report that accompanies this bill, which carries statements both for and against the measure.

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. I wish to make a suggestion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman insists, I will yield to him.

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. I wish to say as to the suggestion of the gentleman about pitching into the work of Congress that the speech made by me was not in reference to pitching into the work of Congress, but merely suggesting that, as Congress was not yet hurried, it should take more time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask that the Members pay some attention to Report No. 4, in which will be found, as an appendix, a letter from the Secretary of State submitting to me, as chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, a paraphrase of reports made to the State Department and containing facts and statistics concerning the situations in the various places in central Europe from which immigrants are coming or trying to come to the United States.

I desire at this time to express my appreciation of the fairness of the views of the minority as expressed in this report signed by the dissenting members of the committee. I believe they are moderately stated and properly stated from their viewpoint. There are two sides to this great problem. However, I am firmly convinced that the United States must act and act very soon for its own protection and for the protection of those who would enter whom we can neither feed nor support nor assimilate. I disagree, of course, with the statement that there has been no time for study or for investigation or for hearings. We have been at it for two years. The newspapers have been full of it. I judge that if we listened to all those demands for time, for hearings, for inquiry we would be holding hearings until eternally too late.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that all the Members will realize that it is almost impossible to discuss this great subject of immigration without making statements that may seem offensive to certain people or classes of people or even to certain countries. I hardly need to say that neither myself nor any member of the Committee on Immigration has any animus or prejudice in the matter. It is our desire to get the facts and place them before the House with the least possible offense to any race, any people, or any country, remembering always that we are trying to act for the best interest of the United States now and for all the years to come.

I was sorry to note in the morning papers, particularly the New York newspapers—I have not seen the others, except the city papers—that the Associated Press, in giving out a statement in connection with this report of the committee, speaks of the appendix, which will be found on page 9, as embracing the views of the Secretary of State, the Hon. Charles E. Hughes. Apparently the newspaper men have drawn that conclusion from

the fact that a letter from the Secretary, dated April 16, submits certain data to me as chairman of the committee. The Secretary's letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 16, 1921.

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,
Chairman Committee on Immigration and Naturalization,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 8, 1921, addressed to Mr. Carr, Director of the Consular Service, requesting the latest available information concerning the numbers and nationalities of aliens who are contemplating emigrating to the United States from abroad.

In reply I beg to inclose a list, accompanied by certain explanatory notes, showing by countries the total number of visés granted each quarter by consular offices in Europe during the year ended December 31, 1920. There are also inclosed paraphrased abstracts of reports concerning immigration received from officials of this Government who have been abroad. The reports are listed under the country and place from which they originated.

Copies of the information sheets inclosed have also been sent to the Hon. LEBARON B. COLT, chairman Committee on Immigration, United States Senate.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

I would take that to be a letter of transmittal. Further, let me say that I may be a bit old-fashioned about our Government and the functions of the legislative and executive branches of it, and that while I desire exceedingly to see restrictive immigration legislation of any kind passed and become a law, I feel that it is not my duty as a Member of this body to see personally and to appeal to the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Labor, or to our President, or to anyone else for this legislation except the Members of this body. To you I present, with the approval of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, this bill and ask for its passage.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. There may be some comment relative to the exhibits attached to this report of the chairman of the committee. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the reports as attached have been modified as much as possible, so that the facts present only about half of the reasons that actually exist?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can not undertake to determine the degree of modification. These reports are paraphrases of reports which are written in other words, and I think it will be admitted that they have been reduced in an effort not to be offensive to the people of foreign countries, to foreign Governments, or to people of foreign birth in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not have time to read these several reports of consular agents and others who made reports to the State Department. It is for the gentlemen of the House to read them.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to insert in the RECORD portions of the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the document referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. As an appendix to Report No. 4 on this bill, H. R. 4075, appears a copy of the letter of Mr. Secretary Hughes transmitting the documents asked for and copies of the documents, as follows:

APPENDIX A.

Following is a letter from the State Department submitting visé statistics and reports from Government officials concerning conditions in Europe:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 16, 1921.

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,
Chairman Committee on Immigration and Naturalization,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 8, 1921, addressed to Mr. Carr, Director of the Consular Service, requesting the latest available information concerning the numbers and nationalities of aliens who are contemplating emigrating to the United States from abroad.

In reply I beg to inclose a list, accompanied by certain explanatory notes, showing by countries the total number of visés granted each quarter by consular offices in Europe during the year ended December 31, 1920. There are also inclosed paraphrased abstracts of reports concerning immigration received from officials of this Government who have been abroad. The reports are listed under the country and place from which they originated.

Copies of the information sheets inclosed have also been sent to the Hon. LEBARON B. COLT, chairman Committee on Immigration, United States Senate.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

Alien visés granted.

Country.	Quarter ended—			
	Mar. 31, 1920.	June 30, 1920.	Sept. 30, 1920.	Dec. 31, 1920.
Austria.....	39	286	490	2,052
Belgium.....	1,638	1,972	2,101	1,325
Bulgaria.....	8	22	24	166
Czechoslovakia.....	902	3,161	9,689	14,313
Danzig.....		10	1,812	399
Denmark.....	1,334	1,330	2,138	1,435
Finland.....	177	305	671	1,190
France.....	2,993	4,060	4,911	4,900
Germany.....	10	518	1,130	1,814
Great Britain and Ireland.....	16,839	24,907	27,228	21,870
Greece.....	5,183	8,323	7,665	9,497
Italy.....	56,154	78,603	62,879	47,335
Jugo-Slavia.....			1,638	4,227
Malta.....	1,230	1,620	814	135
Netherlands.....	2,603	3,177	3,512	1,775
Norway.....	1,501	2,016	2,436	1,825
Poland.....	995	8,252	14,860	20,013
Portugal.....	3,567	3,932	4,093	3,797
Rumania.....	355	1,717	4,099	6,371
Russia.....	5	87	351	1,156
Serbia.....	1,181	2,500	3,344	(1)
Spain.....	5,787	10,189	9,955	7,540
Sweden.....	1,603	2,508	3,420	3,333
Switzerland.....	1,436	1,829	2,389	2,076
Trieste.....				1,411
Turkey.....	796	2,581	2,745	2,703
Total.....	106,335	163,905	174,394	161,658

¹ Incomplete; December reports not received from Belgrade and Rotterdam.
Total 4 quarters, 1920, 606,292.

NOTES ON ALIEN VISÉS GRANTED IN EUROPE.

It should be noted that the foregoing figures of visés granted to aliens coming to the United States are for Europe alone. Figures for the December quarter are incomplete, as reports have not yet been received from several posts. The total will reach about 170,000.

There have been continued and decided increases from nearly all countries where no unusual restriction occurred. In the December quarter visés in Italy fell off to the number of 16,000 because of the action of the Italian Government in refusing passports to would-be emigrants. The number of visés at Danzig was less because in the September quarter Polish passports were viséed at Danzig for a few weeks, and this was discontinued when the Warsaw office was reopened. Spanish visés decreased because of reports in Spain about employment in the United States.

In using the figures of visés granted to aliens by American consuls abroad in connection with the subject of immigration, there are two features of outstanding importance:

1. The totals of these figures in reality show only a movement of emigration from about one-third of the European territory. Aliens are not allowed to come freely to the United States at the present time from Germany, Austria, Hungary, Turkey, and Russia, and the small figures indicated from these countries represent very unusual and extremely urgent cases which have been permitted by the department. The total figures would be very much larger (probably much more than double) if there were free transit between these countries and the United States.

2. As a rule the movement of immigration falls off very considerably in the December quarter, and this has not been the case in 1920, when so many thousands of Europeans are desirous of emigrating to the United States. It was only the enforced restriction in Italy that prevented a considerable increase in the number of visés granted in the December quarter.

The comparatively low figure for the March quarter was due to the lack of transportation facilities, as it was not until May or June that steamship schedules were back to normal.

Following are paraphrased abstracts of reports to the State Department from officers of the United States Government:

POLAND.

Warsaw, March 9, 1921: Steamship companies in Warsaw are beginning to sell second and even first class passenger tickets with a view to obtaining earlier consideration for emigrants desiring to come to the United States. This is due to the tremendous pressure of some 35,000 waiting emigrants or third-class passengers who have been given scheduled dates for the filing of their applications. It is recommended that the health authorities scrutinize carefully all passengers.

Warsaw, February 25, 1921: The Jewish weekly publication *Der Emigrant*, issue of February 10, contains references to the activities of the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society. According to this paper the H. I. A. S. has paid out to 3,100 people an amount of \$1,045,000 in cash and \$590,000 in orders for steamship tickets. The information department of the H. I. A. S. accepted during January 12,000 people; 4,800 telegrams were sent to America, and the Polish visé department accepted 5,000 persons; 5,500 affidavits were registered and filed by the H. I. A. S.

Warsaw: A Jewish newspaper entitled *Der Emigrant*, issue of December 15, of Warsaw, which purports to be published for the purpose of assisting immigrants and which states that it has no connection with any party or group, contains data concerning immigration.

The following points are brought out in this issue:

Jewish economic life has been destroyed by the Great War. The years 1919 and 1920 are considered the worst years. They have been compelled by war to emigrate. "The numerous emigration streams do not acknowledge any limit or any regulation." The emigration stream flows especially from the Ukraine, and many Jews from other countries and districts have already made preparations to start. The paper characterizes passport formalities as "difficult and troublesome." The paper recommends that emigration committees handle these formalities,

Special reference is made to the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society.

The paper describes the duties of this committee as supplying emigrants with lodging, food, and necessary information to protect them from swindlers.

The recent reports that emigration to America is to be stopped is characterized by Der Emigrant as over exaggerated or false and attempts to point out that this country will not stop immigration because of its economic needs. In this connection Der Emigrant says that the "American Government can only regulate immigration so that the immigrants should not get gathered in the port towns as in New York," etc. According to this paper, 80,000 Ukrainian Jews have been obliged to leave their homes, but are unable to settle in Eastern Galicia and must continue their wandering. Very many of these persons are sick and numerous are in bad circumstances. The joint distribution committee supplies these persons with food. Those that have relatives in America are registered by the H. I. A. S. (Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society), which telegraphs to the United States for funds and documents. According to Polish authorities the paper states there are fifty to sixty thousand Ukrainian Jews in Warsaw ready to depart for America. In Galicia there are one hundred or one hundred and twenty thousand Ukrainian Jews. The most difficult thing for the emigrant to comply with formalities is to get personal documents, but the H. I. A. S. assists the emigrant in doing so.

In commenting upon the present conditions in America Der Emigrant gives the opinion of a Dr. Unterman, in which he says that the American Federation of Labor, with Mr. Samuel Gompers at its head, as well as "Wall Street interests," are desirous that immigration be stopped. While the paper admits that there are a large number of people out of employment, it states that this will not affect Jewish immigrants, as they are not employed in the big steel and iron factories where there is no work. The tailor shops, where many Jews are employed, are, according to the paper, not employing, but the paper optimistically expresses the hope that this will not last. The paper suggests that Jewish immigrants engage in the occupation of washing. The report in Poland that steamship tickets to America have been sold out is discounted by the paper.

Warsaw: Passport-control statistics indicate that the following percentage of classes of persons emigrated between December 10, 1920, and January 8, 1921: Forty-three per cent emigrated to join brothers and sisters; 13 per cent emigrated to join husbands and wives; 16 per cent joining parents (however, there are a relatively small proportion of this number minor children); 9 per cent emigrating to join children; 16 per cent emigrating to join distant relatives, including cousins; and 2 per cent of those emigrating have other connections.

Warsaw, March 24, 1921: During February the average number of visas granted daily were 219. The average number for March to date is 222. It is estimated that approximately 40,000 persons have been granted appointments to file their visé applications between March 24 and September 15.

Warsaw: Attention is directed to the character of the majority of the persons who are now leaving Poland for the United States. Only by a visit to the Ellis Island station will it be possible for one in the United States to comprehend the nature of these people, if he has never seen them in their native environment. At the present time it is only too obvious that they must be subnormal, and their normal state is of very low standard. Six years of war and confusion and famine and pestilence have racked their bodies and twisted their mentality. The elders have deteriorated to a marked degree. Minors have grown into adult years with the entire period lost in their rightful development and too frequently with the acquisition of the perverted ideas which have flooded Europe since 1914.

At the present time the average number of persons visiting the visé section of the consulate general at Warsaw is 1,000 daily.

A second predominant feature in the whole movement of these emigrants of all classes is their reason for proceeding to the United States. A pitifully small percentage is moving with a fixed purpose. Hundreds, both Jewish and Christian, or those of no religious profession, have been asked why they wish to go to America. The answer almost invariably is, "Please, mister, we have rich relatives there. We can find an easier life." These are not the Europeans of a sturdier day, who in family conference sternly resolved on the great adventure and set forth on unknown wastes to the new America across the seas. These are not those who hewed the forests, founded the towns, fought the savages, breasted the storms of wilderness, conquered the wastes, and built America. These are beaten folk, spirits broken, in effect driven from their European habitat into the west. They have no desire to form and build. They will exist on what has been prepared for them by a better people. They are in search of an easier life.

General conditions and a phase of the character of the people here form a very fertile soil for the growth of petty graft and scalping. One of the chief things to oppose is petty and grosser graft in passport and visé matters. This vice takes different turns and twists and touches people in more varied walks of life than is usually imagined. It may be considered as beginning with the fabrication of false passports by persons in Poland, which are sold to other persons unable to obtain regular documents for some reason or other. Several gangs engaged in this practice have been broken up. Of similar nature is the forging of visés of foreign officials in Warsaw. When authorities anywhere manage to break up one system here, and disperse one gang, another of different sort immediately appears.

Warsaw is filled to overflowing with people. Before the war a city of between 600,000 and 700,000, the population to-day is estimated at a million or more. With the coming of these mobs have come also thousands of criminals. The Warsaw police, military, do their best to protect the innocent emigrant, but their task is hard.

A number of organizations and individuals operate in Warsaw as relief societies. Chief among these is H. I. A. S. (the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society). H. I. A. S. does all the detail work in connection with procuring passports for Jews from the Polish Government, up to the actual issuance of the passports themselves. H. I. A. S. has a station in Lemberg, where emigrants are assisted and sent on toward Warsaw.

Numerous private individuals from the United States, usually described as "delegates" representing some organization or group of persons in the United States, ordinarily New York City, have come to Europe loaded with American dollars to send people to their relatives or friends in the United States.

The political unrest in Poland is driving many emigrants to other lands. Bolshevik disorders, oppression, and the policy of the Government itself are all contributing factors.

Warsaw: Extracts from articles appearing in the press of Warsaw show that propaganda favoring unrestricted immigration is contemplated. According to these articles this spring great celebrations will take place in New York, with a view to showing in what measure immigrants took part in the general development of the country. A great exhibition will be opened in which different races will take part. The exhibition will attempt to prove that America has profited more from the immigrant than the immigrant from America.

FREE CITY OF DANZIG.

January 31, 1921: Most of the emigrants passing through Danzig are en route from Poland to the United States. Of the 28,499 who were deloused at the Troyl camp during the period from July 3, 1920, to January 1, 1921, 23,895 came from Poland, 1,031 from Czechoslovakia, 758 from Ukraina, 749 from Lithuania and the Baltic States, and 730 from other countries.

Of the 13,646 who left the Troyl camp during the period from October 23, 1920, to January 1, 1921, 12,299 embarked for the United States, 160 for South America, and 1,187 for other countries, principally Canada.

Since practically all of the citizens of Poland must get their visés for the United States in Warsaw, most of the emigrants come directly from that place to Danzig.

BALTIC STATES.

Riga, Latvia, January 14, 1921: In considering the question of emigrants leaving the Baltic States it is important to remember that the recent land laws in all of these States and the present conditions have given to the small peasant a desire to cultivate the land, an opportunity which they have never before enjoyed. Few of these people are, therefore, leaving the country, and this is the class from which desirable emigrants have been drawn. The class of Letts and Lithuanians who are leaving are the people from the slums of the cities and towns and are of an undesirable type.

RUMANIA.

Bucharest: A large number of undesirable aliens are applying for permission to proceed to the United States. Besides being as a class economic parasites, tailors, small salesmen, butchers, etc., they are not unsympathetic with bolshevik ideas. Emigrants from Bessarabia fall within the above-mentioned class. While continued rumors concerning the exaggerated opportunities for employment and salaries in the United States are heard, no real evidence of any organized propaganda encouraging emigration has been found. It is thought that any rumors concerning propaganda for encouraging emigration originates from advertisements of steamer sailings published by steamship agencies, from general dissatisfaction with local conditions, and from comments thereon from returning emigrants and their comparison with conditions in America. This "natural" propaganda can not, of course, be traced but the Rumanian authorities are opposed to propaganda for encouraging emigration to America. To investigate conditions at the source of emigration by way of establishing a basis for reasonable suspicions against emigrants on criminal grounds is at present impracticable. The class of persons who form the majority of emigrants from Bessarabia offer no particular value to our country as productive labor, but rather increase our burden of petty middlemen with ideals of moral and business dealings difficult to assimilate with our own. While some of the large relief organizations are doing good work in relieving the distressed people in this country, a large part of their work consists in transmitting funds and furnishing material assistance to persons who have decided to emigrate. There is reported considerable smuggling of refugees from the Ukraine into Bessarabia, and it is claimed that many of these are able to obtain Rumanian passports.

Bucharest, January 8, 1921: The director general of police of Rumania has issued an order excusing all Jews from military service and permitting their discharge from the army if they desire to emigrate to America. While these persons and others of Russian origin who may be residents of Rumania have no difficulty in obtaining permission to depart, Transylvanians on the other hand, who for the most part are agricultural laborers, encounter great difficulty in obtaining the authorization to emigrate.

Bucharest, March 19, 1921: There are on an average 1,500 persons waiting examination for permission to leave for the United States. The increase is due to the fear of anti-immigration laws and to present good weather. From January 16 to March 15 the daily average was 103.06 visés granted by the consulate.

SERBIA.

Belgrade: There has been a tendency in Yugoslavia to look unfavorably upon any large emigration from that country, as it is thought that the new Kingdom needs all its citizens for its own proper future development.

Polish emigrants in transit through Yugoslavia constitute a sanitary menace.

Zagreb: It is estimated that under present regulations 15,000 emigrants will proceed to the United States before July. This number will be doubled if the restrictions against former Austrian soldiers are abolished.

RUSSIAN CAUCASUS.

Tiflis: The monthly average of visés granted at Tiflis is about 10. It is roughly estimated that at least 1,000 persons in the Tiflis district, which include Armenians, Georgians, Azerbaijanis, and such Russians and Persians as reside in the Caucasus, are now awaiting an opportunity to emigrate to the United States, but should the soviet government continue in Armenia and should Georgia be invaded by the Turkish nationalists or soviet Russia the number is likely to very greatly exceed this estimate. It may be accepted as nearly literally true that every Armenian family which has enough money to get away or is not impregnated with bolshevism will ultimately endeavor to emigrate to America. Russians and Georgians are likely more and more to emigrate to the same haven, as permission to go to England, France, and Italy is made constantly more difficult.

The great bulk of emigrants to the United States from this district are highly undesirable as material for future American citizens. They are not only illiterate, but the years of unsettled conditions in which they have been forced to live have caused them to lose the habit of work. Their physical and moral courage is greatly depleted, as well as their physical constitutions. The bulk of them have been habituated either to lawlessness or to the exercise of violence in the name of the law for so long that if not actually impregnated with bolshevism they are good material for bolshevik propaganda. Our restrictions on immigration should be so rigid that it would be impossible for the most of these people to enter the United States. Reference is especially made

to Armenians, Jews, Persians, and Russians of the ordinary classes, all of which have been so driven hither and thither since 1914 that they can not be regarded as desirable populations for any country. There are, of course, many individual exceptions.

MESOPOTAMIA.

Bagdad: It is estimated that 5,000 Armenians and 20,000 Assyrians would proceed immediately to the United States but for the lack of funds and present restrictions. Rigid restrictions are recommended in view of the fact that the present population of the United States is becoming too heterogeneous.

GERMANY.

Berlin: The January issue of the *Allgemeine Deutsche Auswanderer Zeitung* states that 9,154 Germans have emigrated overseas in the period from the end of the war until October, 1920, and all except 616 sailed from Hamburg and Bremen. Further, that despite difficulties adverse to emigration, such as passport formalities and depreciation of the German mark, the number of emigrants almost doubled in the second year.

AUSTRIA.

Vienna: While there are no Government restrictions on emigration from Austria, the great depreciation of Austrian currency—at present about 10,000 per cent—make the cost of passage far too high to be within the reach of those who would be tempted to try their fortune in the United States if the steamship ticket could be bought in crowns at the prewar rate of exchange.

Nearly all persons now emigrating to the United States travel on tickets sent to them by relatives in the United States.

BELGIUM.

Antwerp, January 24, 1921: Emigration from Belgium to the United States in 1920 was very small, the total being 7,402, of whom practically 5,220 went to the United States; 31,984 emigrants embarked at this port in 1920, out of which 23,453 went to the United States, Mexico, and Central America. A large percentage of those leaving for Canada merely passed through that country in transit. The Belgian emigrants were largely farm laborers, industrial workers, and a desirable class. They were mostly destined for the Middle West. Poles and Czechoslovaks of the Jewish race made up the greater number of emigrants from this port. These emigrants passed through Antwerp and Rotterdam, as Antwerp and Rotterdam are the natural outlets of this traffic. The monthly emigration statistics from April, 1919, to December 31, 1920, show a steady increase of emigration from central Europe passing through this port. Belgian emigration is decreasing rather than increasing.

The prospects for 1921 are that there will be a small emigration from Belgium proper but an increased number of Poles and Czechoslovaks and other central Europeans passing through its ports, practically all bound for the United States. The severest kind of control should be exercised over these emigrants from central Europe, as this type of immigrant is not desirable from any point of view at this time.

SPAIN.

Santander, January 25, 1921: During the year 1920 alien passports to the number of 3,552 were viséed by the consul at Santander, as against 903 in 1919. Most of the emigrants were stonemasons, miners, and tobacco workers, who went to Vermont, West Virginia, and Florida. While the greater number were bound for the United States, there were a number destined for Porto Rico and the Philippines. The increase in passport fees apparently had no effect on the movement of persons from this port of Spain.

Bilbao: The emigrants from the Spanish Basque Provinces to the United States are principally of the shepherd class who are proceeding to sheep ranches in Idaho, Nevada, and California. They are in general a thrifty, sturdy people, of little education, and not possessed of a high order of intelligence.

Corunna: The principal newspapers of Corunna have published an official bulletin to the effect that on account of the present industrial crisis large numbers of Spanish immigrants are without work and are applying for repatriation. Since the publication of the news and warnings concerning labor conditions in the United States emigration from the Corunna district have practically ceased. In consequence of the suspension of passenger sailings from Corunna and Vigo direct to New York and of the diversion of Spanish emigration to Cuba, Mexico, and South America the alien visé work at Corunna has practically ceased.

There has been a heavy falling off in the emigration to Cuba, owing to the present economic crisis in that country. Only 1,121 passengers have embarked at Corunna for Cuba in January, compared with 3,881 in December. The emigration to Argentina has also diminished, but not to the same extent as to Cuba. During the month of January only 11 emigrants embarked at Corunna for the United States, and these passengers were landed at New Orleans. Since December 1 of last year no passenger steamers have sailed from either Vigo or Corunna to New York, and any resumption of service will depend upon the movement of Spanish emigration, which is controlled by industrial and labor conditions in the United States, Cuba, and South America. The following numbers of Spanish emigrants embarked at Corunna during January: For Cuba, 1,121; for Mexico, 73; for Brazil, 20; for Argentina, 870; and for the United States, 11.

Madrid, March 15, 1921: The *Gaceta de Madrid* of March 15, 1921, contains a royal order, which appropriated the sum of 500,000 pesetas for the repatriation of Spanish emigrants who are at this time in the United States without work or means of subsistence, preference being given to those who have a large family.

PORTUGAL.

Lisbon: During the past two months there has been a very noticeable falling off in Portuguese citizens who apply for permission to proceed to the United States. Exchange has fluctuated to an extent that it now takes 10 escudos to buy an American dollar, and as the passenger fares to America are calculated on a dollar basis this means that in Portuguese money fares are two-thirds higher than they were four months ago. Many disquieting letters, some of which have been published in the local newspapers, have lately been received from former Portuguese emigrants to America. These letters describe the closing down or going on short time of many New England factories and of new immigrants finding themselves strangers in a foreign land, with whose language, with manners and customs they are not fully acquainted, out of work, and many without any funds or resources and with no prospect of getting work in the near future, in the most deplorable circumstances. Portuguese emigration to the United States is governed by the law of supply and demand, and this emigration from the nearness of Portugal to America and the communications

which the Portuguese in America keep up with friends and relatives in the land of their birth is probably much more sensitive to and reacts much more readily from financial and labor conditions than does that from many other lands. In view of the more recent announcements of labor conditions in the textile factories of New England stating that these factories are now reopening but at reduced wages, the emigration from Portugal may revive.

Funchal, Madeira: Emigration from Madeira to the United States during the quarter ended December 31, 1920, showed a great decrease as compared with the three previous quarters, the total visés granted by the American consulate being only 103, as compared with 1,251 during the September quarter and 878 and 828 during the June and March quarters, respectively. The total to the United States for the year 1920 was 3,060, as compared with 1,052 in 1912, 1,580 in 1913, 2,268 in 1916, 571 in 1917, 46 in 1918, and 364 in 1919.

The emigration to the United States in 1920 almost equaled the total emigration from the island in 1912 and 1913, which was 3,249 and 3,296, respectively. Total figures for 1920 are not yet available, but it is believed that the number will exceed 6,000, as approximately the same number of emigrants went to Brazil as to the United States.

The principal reason for the decrease to the United States during the last three months of the year was the closing down of many of the New England textile factories which had employed large numbers of Portuguese workmen.

BRITISH GUIANA.

Georgetown: During the year 1920, 453 individuals departed for the United States from Georgetown. Two hundred and eighty-three of these persons were of African descent, and 175 whites. Of the total number going to the United States, 309 declared their intention of remaining more or less permanently, while 144 indicated their intention to remain for a short period only. Practically all of the emigrants of African extraction intended to remain in the United States permanently, while the whites, with the exception of a few Portuguese, visited the United States only for a vacation or in transit to Canada or England. Two hundred and seven of these persons expressed their intention to reside in New York, and by far the greater proportion in a district on the West Side between One hundred and thirty-fifth and One hundred and fiftieth Streets. There appears to be a small but constant volume of emigration from British Guiana to the United States, consisting largely of persons of African descent, who settle for the most part in New York City.

WEST INDIES.

Barbados: There are a large number of persons of African extraction leaving Barbados and other islands in the West Indies for the United States. The majority of them are going to New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. Their chief occupation is servant, barber, elevator boy, etc.

MEXICO.

Vera Cruz, February 12, 1921: Attempts are being made by emigrants to reach the United States through Mexico, and it is quite evident that this port will be the base of a concerted movement to be the back door entrance to the United States. A number of immigrants have applied at Vera Cruz for visés for the United States, but upon being advised that it was necessary to procure permission from the Department of State at Washington, they failed to return and complete the necessary arrangements.

[NOTE BY CHAIRMAN.—Reports concerning immigration from Italy have not been received by the State Department, since the Italian Government, on December 15 last, announced that it would withhold passports to its nationals desiring to emigrate to the United States.]

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I hope to be able to yield shortly.

You will note that the reports are of two kinds. They refer to those who would come in and those who would go out. Note the report from Madrid, with this intelligence:

Madrid, March 15, 1921: The *Gaceta de Madrid* of March 15, 1921, contains a royal order, which appropriated the sum of 500,000 pesetas for the repatriation of Spanish emigrants who are at this time in the United States without work or means of subsistence, preference being given to those who have a large family.

When this committee was before Congress only last December with a bill which proposed to suspend immigration partially we called your attention to the fact that Italians were coming to the United States in solid shiploads seeking what they thought would be high wages, a new form of immigration, comparatively speaking, to the United States. We called attention also to the fact that the Spanish Government was issuing accident insurance for its emigrants, giving them extra insurance in case of death or accident while they were emigrating to another country. The situation is changed, and that country is now paying for the support of its people now here, and is aiding them to get back to that country.

So the emergency seems to be past, so far as that immigration is concerned, but the consular reports will call your attention to some other immigration of broken peoples, who can only come with assistance. I shall discuss that phase of it later in the debate.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In a moment. Let me explain the bill briefly. This is a bill to limit the immigration of aliens of various nationalities into the United States to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationalities, foreign residents in the United States, as determined by the United States census of 1910. That is what is known as the Dillingham plan. This bill is not the bill that passed the House in December last. It is not the bill which passed the Senate. It is not the bill accepted in conference. But this bill has that

plan. It follows paragraph by paragraph the framework, but nearly every paragraph has been amended by your committee. We have modified the plan for the working machinery. We have undertaken to make the bill easier of operation. The bill is broadened in several particulars. The Senate bill was much more of a restrictive measure than the original House bill of last year. We have gone on the theory that it is desirable to limit immigration to 3 per cent of the number of foreign born in the United States according to the census of 1910, and the gross number that might be admitted on that percentage basis would be about 350,000, that we should make the plan of counting such that about that number might be admitted. We have assumed that it would hardly be fair to then count those aliens leaving the United States, who are entitled to return to the United States from a temporary visit abroad. Therefore, your committee has stricken that class from the number that might be counted, and provided that those aliens who go out and are entitled to return under present immigration laws shall return without being counted, thus leaving the maximum number of new aliens who might come in at 3 per cent, or about 355,000 odd.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SINNOTT. In case more than 3 per cent apply to come to our country from some foreign country; in case, say, 5 per cent apply, who makes the selection of the 3 per cent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Incoming aliens come with passports. They must have passports from their Governments and visés of those passports by our consular agents. Should there be a surplus from any country undertaking to seek passport visés, the consular agent at that particular place would have, on the information here of the number which can be received, to refuse further visés.

Mr. SINNOTT. Would the consular agent calculate on the 3 per cent from the foreign country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No. His power to visé would not go beyond the number that might be permitted to proceed to the United States.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. ROSSDALE. I would like to know what would be the effect if we took it on the basis of the 1920 census instead of the census of 1910.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can not answer exactly until we get the census figures of 1920. They are not now available.

Mr. ROSSDALE. You have not got the figures?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But I will say this, that the immigration to the United States from certain countries was so large prior to the taking of the census of 1920 that if it is desired to use the figures of the 1920 census it will then be desirable to reduce the percentage for an admission base.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Did not the gentleman just say that he did not have those figures?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman asked me for the exact figures of the 1920 census. They are not available.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Not the exact figures, but the approximate figures.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I might be able to give those.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman's report states that the majority of the immigrants coming to-day are physically deficient, economically undesirable, of low standards of living, and not the most desirable sort. Yet everyone of those immigrants under the present system had to have his passport viséed. I know the gentleman believes that our consular officers abroad ought to have a measure of discretion in viséing passports. Does the gentleman think that such an amendment, granting that discretion to them, would be germane to this bill; and second, would the gentleman approve such an amendment if it were held in order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me say that one objection to the so-called suspension bill, exempting blood relatives, which passed this House December 15 last, was that it undertook to combine the immigration laws and passport regulations. This bill is an immigration bill. It says nothing about passports.

Mr. ROGERS. But does not the gentleman think that the consular officers abroad ought to have the right to decline to visé the passport of an intending immigrant if he is a syphilitic, or a degenerate, or a leper, or anything of that sort?

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois in a moment.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman, so far as he is able to do so, accept an amendment giving consular officers some broader authority in that respect?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to reserve the right to examine the amendment. It is clearly apparent that the time is coming soon when one committee or the other will have to make the passport situation fit the immigration situation. This is a temporary measure, designed primarily and brought before this House in the hope that we may have 14 months' time in which we may perfect the immigration laws and properly fit passport regulations to them. That will not be an easy task.

Mr. ROGERS. But the gentleman knows that it is exceedingly difficult to get legislation through Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Indeed, I do.

Mr. ROGERS. It would be very easy, with the gentleman's assistance, to get through as a part of this bill such an amendment as I propose.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I would like to inquire if it is not true that our consuls abroad now have discretion with reference to viséing passports? I have never understood that a consul abroad granted a visé as a matter of right. In fact, I have had many cases for my own constituents, and the State Department have said they could not give any advice in advance as to what action would be taken by the consul on the other side, and that the action of the consul in viséing a passport was not conclusive on the immigration inspectors when the immigrant arrived here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Quite so. A visé is not permission to enter the United States, but no visé is a decided bar.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me yield first to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that the class of immigrants to whom the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] alluded, suffering with all kinds of ailments, are now excluded by the present immigration law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Certain of them are. I prefer to take that up later.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman further spoke of a provision to prevent the sick, such as syphilitics, from coming here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. We already have a law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. But is it not a fact that we have been short of medical men over there to do this work properly?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Perhaps short of men, perhaps short of opportunity, and in some places short of permission.

Mr. TEMPLE. In answer to the gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. LAZARO] and to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], I wish to say that the class of persons spoken of are excluded by the immigration authorities after they reach American ports.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; supposed to be excluded, but often sent to hospitals on the appeal of relatives.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] is inquiring whether it would not be wise to authorize our consuls abroad to see that persons of that kind never reach American ports by refusing to visé their passports, and the consul does not have that authority now.

Mr. LAZARO. We have always been short of medical officers on the other side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield any further. I can see that it would be impossible to attempt to answer all the questions which I would like to answer without devoting my whole hour to that, and I do not desire to take up the hour. Under the five-minute rule the bill will then be thoroughly discussed.

Before closing let me say again that those who seek a restriction of immigration because of the situation in the United States are met openly with an organized opposition. I have here a bulletin to members from the Interracial Council, which, if I am not mistaken, includes as one of its branches the organized foreign-language newspapers. The council issued an appeal for the defeat of the last bill, the one which died at the White House. I believe the Interracial Council holds that its appeal to President Wilson did the business. With the appeal which goes to thousands of the members of the Interracial Council, including many big employers of common labor, goes a personal letter. It asks members to get busy and to work on Congressmen and Senators in an effort to defeat this bill. They would try to defeat any bill. They talk about careful selection

and intelligent distribution. Most such opponents really want neither. They want selection of the unintelligent and distribution in lots of 1,000, f. o. b. at the factory door. I have many letters calling attention to the fact that the foreign-language newspapers themselves are a force and a power against the passage of any legislation tending to restrict immigration into the United States. As a rule foreign-language newspapers thrive on foreign-language readers. Talk about assimilation. A speaking and reading knowledge of English is the key to assimilation. The processes of assimilation and amalgamation are slow and difficult. We have millions on hand now needing assimilation.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Briefly.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has stated that Congress is overwhelmingly in favor of a proper bill. Why is it that the gentleman's committee can not bring before us and let us vote for the kind of a bill that the gentleman himself would like to see passed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman is himself a member of committees of the House, and probably knows the difficulty of bringing out any particular desired legislation. However, speaking for myself personally, I am for any kind of legislation to restrict immigration into the United States from all countries until we have cleaned house here and know what we are going to do with the millions of unnaturalized aliens who are now here. [Applause.]

My friends; this is a serious matter from any point of view, in addition to a viewpoint concerning those poor starving people in central Europe driven from pillar to post. Who does not sympathize with them? I would to God that this country could hold out its hands to all of those millions and say, "Come here." But we can not do it. Can not you see the signs of trouble? Oh, it would be better that we give the half of all that we possess in means to help sustain them where they are than to bring them here. That, of course, applies to peoples in other countries, too, in our present condition. Distress is here; discontent is here; world problems are here to make mischief right here.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can not yield now. An article in the World Outlook by the Rev. Panunzio is similar to matter put out by him through the federated churches which reach sympathetic people in the United States. It is one of three or four articles. He dresses as an emigrant, buys his ticket to go abroad, and mingles with the outgoing people and asks them in their languages why they are going away. Some of their reasons are dislike of America; America is all right for a single man, but not a place to bring up a family; children are treated like beasts in the streets; no room to bring them up here; it is work, work, work, and no play; it is not a free country, and so on. From an Italian comes the complaint that the wine was taken away; and one says, "The labor union made me wear a red tie for \$2 a month." I wish I had time to read it all. Dr. Panunzio favors immigration; he opposes deportations. He does not like things here; he is going to reform things by making more discontent.

Recently a friend of mine went on a ship bound for a Scandinavian country and interviewed 200 as to why they were going out of the United States. Many of them had been here 20 years, made money, and they made these statements without knowing that it would reach me: That the United States was not what it used to be; that it was not now a place for them; that conditions which you know and I know, and which I need not describe here, exist in the cities, even the smaller cities. They see the unrest, they hear the agitators, native born and foreign, and as they go out they say they want none of it. Gentlemen, I think we are coming to a real danger and that we should not feed fuel to it. Let us get on an even keel before we again permit a million a year to come in.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Does the gentleman want us to take the discontented remarks of a few outgoing emigrants as the ideas of the great body of immigrants?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, no.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman indicate to the House just what difference there is between this measure and the one adopted in conference at the last session?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The report states it briefly at the beginning. We have added to those exempted. The gentleman will understand that in addition to the 3 per cent admitted travelers for business or pleasure are exempted and may come at will. We have added to the exemptions those

returning to the United States from temporary visits abroad. You will find a committee amendment also which exempts those fleeing from religious persecution, using the exact language in the present immigration act. Certain alien soldiers who went from here are exempted. I think those are the principal changes; the other changes are merely verbiage to perfect the text. In the report you will find the figures of the number of immigrants that might be permitted under the 3 per cent basis. I will insert that table and the table of recent immigration.

I would like to call attention to the fact that I have here under the date of March 15 a statement that the United States is called on to aid 400,000 unemployed in New York City alone. This report develops Secretary Davis's plan to formulate a relief plan in order to help 400,000 people out of work in the city of New York. Every Member of Congress from every district in the land knows something about the condition of labor in his district, and there is no need of discussing that. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The table referred to is as follows:

Admissions permissible on 3 per cent basis.

The 3 per cent immigration based on the 1910 census will permit in one year the following immigration from the various countries of Europe, in addition to the immigration permitted by the liberal exemption clauses referred to in a preceding paragraph:

Northwestern Europe:	
Belgium	1,482
Denmark	5,449
France	3,523
Germany	75,040
Netherlands	3,624
Norway	12,116
Sweden	19,956
Switzerland	3,745
United Kingdom	77,206
Total northwestern Europe	202,212
Outside northwestern Europe:	
Austria	50,117
Bulgaria	345
Serbia	139
Greece	3,038
Montenegro	161
Italy	40,294
Portugal	1,781
Rumania	1,978
Spain	663
Russia	51,974
Turkey in Europe	967
Turkey in Asia	1,792
Total outside northwestern Europe	153,249
Total northwestern Europe	202,212
Grand total	355,461

Should the bill become a law prior to the date contemplated, May 10, additional immigration to the amount of one-sixth of the figures given will be permitted.

Immigrant and nonimmigrant aliens admitted to the United States since July 1, 1920, by months.

Month.	Immigrant.	Nonimmigrant.	Total.
1920.			
July	62,832	21,127	83,959
August	67,369	18,062	85,431
September	70,031	18,821	88,852
October	74,800	26,200	101,000
November	65,900	23,100	89,000
December	68,100	23,900	92,000
1921.			
January	70,500	15,500	86,000
February	65,000	15,000	80,000
Total	550,532	161,710	712,242

Exact figures later than September not yet available. Those given for later months are estimated.

Figures for March immigration show an influx at all ports of approximately 70,000, with departures numbering 28,000. At Ellis Island alone the immigrant movement for March was: Inward, 43,100; outward, 18,900.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] in favor of the bill for one hour.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 10 minutes to Mr. WILSON, of Louisiana, one of the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California yields 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON] and reserves the remainder of his time.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the present bill proposes to limit immigration from any foreign country during the next fiscal year to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons

of such nationality resident in the United States as shown by the United States census of the year 1910.

This would make permissible an annual influx of 355,461 persons from all European countries. This is about one-third of the number coming in normal times before the war. All indications now point to an inflow from the various countries in Europe in excess of any of the prewar years.

While I am going to support and vote for this bill, I prefer the original House bill which provided for the suspension of immigration for the period of two years. My own judgment is that the period of suspension should be longer.

I do not like to assent even temporarily to the proposition that any foreign nation shall be given the right and privilege of having admitted to this country any fixed number of its population during any prescribed period. Again, the percentage plan, as adopted in this measure, is objectionable for the reason that it opens up the way for too great an influx from our enemy countries of central Europe. For instance, under this bill 75,040 Germans and 50,117 Austrians could be admitted annually. Should these come to America, as they surely will, it is seriously to be doubted that they would ever become very much attached to the United States and its institutions. Former experience will create in the minds of American citizens a state of uncertainty as to why and for what purposes they might come. But without this or some other restrictive measure being enacted, as soon as the state of war between the United States and these countries is declared to be at an end and peace is concluded, which is likely to occur at an early date, then their nationals might come here in unlimited numbers. Hence all who favor restriction of immigration can readily support this measure, at least as an alternative temporary proposition, and probably the best obtainable at this time. This, with slight modifications, is the former Senate bill which had the almost unanimous approval of that body after the rejection of the House suspension bill.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I could not hear the gentleman very distinctly, and I just want the gentleman to repeat it. Did the gentleman say that it was logical to assume that immigrants who were about to come to this country would not make American citizens and would not be much attached to our country?

Mr. WILSON. I said it is seriously doubted that the immigrants coming to this country from Austria and Germany now would be in full spirit and sympathy with our institutions.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Has the gentleman in mind figures to show that these men were not very much attached to this country, judging from the way that they supported this country during the war?

Mr. WILSON. The old immigrants were, but the gentleman must remember several things have occurred since those came here. I decline to yield further.

Mr. MASON. Under this bill the gentleman gave a very much larger number, some 77,000.

Mr. WILSON. No; 75,040.

The conditions making necessary legislation either suspending or radically restricting immigration are imperative, and just as compelling at this time as at any period since the close of the war. Conditions of unemployment are more aggravated. Conservative estimates place the number of unemployed in this country at this time at more than 4,000,000, and no program has yet been proposed for immediate action that insures that business revival and general prosperity necessary to provide for their reemployment.

We should keep in mind the fact that there is a limit to the capacity of this country to absorb people of other nationalities. The Republican platform adopted at Chicago says:

The immigration policy of the United States should be such as to insure that the number of foreigners in the country at any time shall not exceed that which can be assimilated with reasonable rapidity.

If that platform declaration is to be further taken into consideration, the correct thing to do would be to suspend immigration completely for at least a period of 10 years, or for an indefinite period. If we mean by "assimilation" that the foreigner shall become a homogeneous part of the American population, in full sympathy and accord with the character and spirit of our institutions, with undivided loyalty to our Constitution and the flag of the Republic, then the mass of aliens now in this country present a problem that will require a number of years to solve. There are now some 10,000,000 aliens in America unnaturalized and who have taken no steps to become a part and parcel of the American people. In addition to these it is quite well known that there are several million others who in the proper acceptance of the term are unassimilated and who belong to those groups of foreign birth and extraction,

many of whom may be naturalized and have American citizenship, but who still belong to that class designated by Gen. Pershing as those who "attempt to decide American questions for a foreign reason."

Our work of assimilation will not be complete and our system of Americanization will continue to be a failure until the condition to which Gen. Pershing so strenuously objects is removed. It makes no difference whether an attempt is made to decide American questions for foreign reasons in mass meetings, in the press, or at the ballot box. The man who attempts to shape American questions to foreign standards and to settle them upon the basis of beneficial results to some foreign country can not be a good American citizen. Hence the work of assimilation is so far behind in this country that every means should be adopted to prevent any further complications.

In his address to Congress on April 12, 1921, President Harding said:

The surest procedure in every government is to put its own house in order.

The essential basic condition necessary for this procedure is unity and accord in that house—concert in sympathy and in action toward one ultimate purpose and without reference to any other habitation.

We hear and read constantly about "Americanization." Existing conditions have brought the thoughtful American citizen to a very earnest consideration of this question, and a general public demand has arisen for some practical solution. Bills are now pending in Congress, and others will no doubt be introduced, calling for many millions in appropriations from the Federal Treasury to carry on the work of Americanization by cooperative action by the Federal Government with the public-school systems of the several States. In my judgment, the Committee on Immigration can offer a solution of this question, in so far as the foreign element is concerned, and that such solution can be reached without any further charges on the Federal Treasury.

I do not believe that a condition now exists, or will ever exist, to justify any measure that may eventually lead to control of the public-school systems in the various States by the Federal Government. Participation by the National Government with appropriations from its Treasury will eventually lead largely, if not completely, to such control.

In speaking of appropriations for public highways in his message to Congress of April 12 the President said:

Large Federal outlay demands a Federal voice in the program of expenditure.

Few will dispute the correctness of that proposition, and yet it must carry with it a Federal voice and finally Federal control of the program of procedure and execution.

If the Committee on Immigration can devise some practical means of carrying on the work of Americanization of aliens without demanding appropriations from the National Treasury and without endangering the public-school systems of the various States and cities by Federal interference and control, it will have to its credit constructive legislation that should win the approval and applause of the entire country.

Another phase of this problem, which is now a live question before the public, is the proposal of the present Commissioner General of Immigration to divert immigrants to the farms. The entire country has become intensely interested in this program. If it can be successfully worked out, lasting good will be accomplished for the United States and for her immigrant population. Here I venture to suggest that it is not necessary in connection with this program to open wide the gates for a new influx of foreigners. In this work of assimilation and distribution there is already a full supply in our cities and congested centers to meet all agricultural demands if they can be induced to go to the farms and become a permanent part of our agricultural industry. It will not add much to the situation to make a temporary farm laborer out of the immigrant and it is hardly possible to make a farmer out of an immigrant or anyone else overnight. Placing a man on a farm does not make a farmer out of him. I believe it is practicable and feasible, however, to induce a portion of the present population now congested in the great centers to go to the agricultural districts, provided there is some practical way offered by which they may become home owners and proprietors of the farms on which they are to live. Many of them have had experience in agricultural pursuits, but city wages are deemed preferable to tenant life on a farm.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I will yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. WILSON. No system can be devised by which any governmental department can say to the immigrant when he arrives in this country, or to any certain per cent of them, "You shall go to a certain place in the United States and engage in farming." The only practical solution of the problem would be to have a selective system under which immigrants who were engaged in agriculture in the home country might be admitted to this country on their application for the purpose of following like pursuits here. This system would involve the adoption of a policy which would apply to all immigration requiring the selection to be made before securing passage to this country. The qualifications and admissibility of the immigrant should be settled on the other side and his fitness for entrance here fully determined before he sails from the home port.

Under this kind of system the Commissioner General could have the farm located and ready and could know that he was securing a farmer from the other side, and the immigrant could come assured in advance that he would find a home in a free country where he might pursue his chosen occupation.

During the period covered by this temporary measure such a selective system should be worked out and adopted as the permanent policy of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hicks].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of the bill a question or two. In his report he gives a list of the countries from which immigration will be permitted and states the number, based on the 1910 census returns, and in that it states that from Serbia there can come, in case this bill passes, 139, based on the provisions of this measure. As a result of the war the territorial area of Serbia has been increased very materially. The population of Serbia in 1910 was 3,500,000, whereas to-day the population of Serbia is about 13,500,000. I realize that there is a provision, on page 4, which is intended to cover this. It provides that officials of the Government shall prepare a statement showing the number of persons resident in the United States who were born within the area included or annexed to such countries, when such transfer of territory has been recognized by the United States, and that this estimate shall then be the basis for admittance.

Now, I assume that the increase of the Serbian territory taken from Austria has been recognized by this country, because we have accepted a minister from that country and have sent one to it. So I presume that provision has been met. But I want to ask the gentleman from Washington if in estimating the number of people born in that country which has been taken into Serbia it provides for the nationality of those people, whether they are Austrians, Serbians, or what they are, or is it merely the territory which is to be considered?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think the gentleman, if he will study the paragraph which we have written in this bill, and which is entirely different from the paragraph in the previous bill, will find the place of birth controls. That is to say, if a part of Austria has been taken into Serbia, and the Serbian quota is full, he comes in on account of his Austrian birth.

Mr. HICKS. So it will automatically reduce the Austrians who will be admitted and increase the number of Serbians.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Remembering all the time that it is a temporary measure, intended to cover 14 months of time. Judging from the appeal that comes from people that we may make a treaty, it would indicate that all of these people in Europe are bending this way, whether we want them or not.

Mr. HICKS. The main point with me is that Serbia, with increased boundaries, will be given a larger number of immigrants than stated in this report would be allowed her. This I understand will be the case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think so.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a full list showing the number of visés that have been granted during 1920, the number of immigrants who have arrived during 1920, and how it would operate under the 3 per cent provision. If we take Belgium, for example, the total number of visés granted for the year 1920 is 7,036, but under this 3 per cent provision only 1,482 could enter the United States in one year. If we take Bulgaria, the number of visés is 220, and the number that can enter will be 345. If we take Denmark, the number of visés is 6,237, and the number that can enter is 5,449. If we take France, the number of visés granted were 16,864, and the number to come here is 3,523 inside of a year, or one-fifth of the number. If we take Germany, the number of visés granted is 3,472, and the number that would come over under the 3 per cent provision is 75,040.

The table is as follows:

Alien visés granted.

Country.	Quarter ended—				Total, 1920.	Under 3 per cent provision.
	Mar. 31, 1920.	June 30.	Sept. 30.	Dec. 31.		
Austria.....	39	286	490	2,032	2,867	50,117
Belgium.....	1,638	1,972	2,101	1,325	7,036	1,482
Bulgaria.....	8	22	24	166	220	345
Czechoslovakia.....	902	3,161	9,689	14,313	28,065
Danzig.....	10	1,812	399	2,221
Denmark.....	1,334	1,330	2,138	1,485	6,237	5,449
Finland.....	177	305	671	1,190	2,343
France.....	2,996	4,060	4,911	4,900	16,864	3,523
Germany.....	10	518	1,130	1,814	3,472	75,040
Great Britain and Ireland.....	16,839	24,907	27,228	21,870	90,844	77,205
Greece.....	5,183	8,323	7,065	9,497	30,668	3,038
Italy.....	56,154	78,603	62,870	47,335	244,971	40,294
Jugo-Slavia.....	1,638	4,227	5,865
Malta.....	1,230	1,620	814	135	3,799
Netherlands.....	2,608	3,177	3,512	3,775	10,067	3,624
Norway.....	1,501	2,016	2,436	1,825	7,778	12,116
Poland.....	995	8,252	14,860	20,013	44,120
Portugal.....	3,567	3,932	4,063	3,797	15,359	1,781
Rumania.....	355	1,717	4,099	6,371	12,542	1,978
Russia.....	5	87	351	1,156	1,599	51,974
Serbia.....	1,181	2,500	3,244	(?)	7,025	139
Spain.....	5,787	10,189	9,955	7,540	33,471	603
Sweden.....	1,603	2,508	3,420	3,333	10,864	10,936
Switzerland.....	1,436	1,820	2,389	2,076	7,730	3,745
Trieste.....	1,411	1,411
Turkey.....	796	2,581	2,745	2,703	8,825	2,739
Total.....	106,335	163,905	174,394	161,658

¹Includes Austria-Hungary.

²Includes entire United Kingdom.

³Incomplete. December reports not received from Belgrade and Rotterdam.

⁴Includes Poland.

⁵Includes Turkey in Europe and Asia.

Total, four quarters, 1920, 606,292.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman stated that there were some 16,864 visés from France.

Mr. SIEGEL. For 1920.

Mr. BLACK. Does that necessarily mean that all of these numbers who secure these visés were immigrants to this country?

Mr. SIEGEL. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLACK. That means that actually there were that number of immigrants?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Why does the gentleman say the number of visés indicates the number of immigrants?

Mr. SIEGEL. For this reason: That the total number of visés granted were 606,292 from Europe alone. The total number, according to the estimate of the Secretary of State, from the whole world, including South America, was 189,000. That, of course, does not take into consideration the number that have left that country. The average number leaving is practically 37,000 per month, with the exception of March, that sent approximately forty-odd thousand through Ellis Island alone, which takes in 87 per cent of all immigration.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Do the number of visés which you have given as coming from France mean the number of immigrants coming from France to this country?

Mr. SIEGEL. Correct.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. What happens to those who come as visitors or on business? They must have visés.

Mr. SIEGEL. These are supposed to include the immigrant visés which have been granted.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. If the gentleman will revise his statement and say that the visés of the immigrants amounted to so much, of course, that will show the number of immigrants.

Mr. SIEGEL. But so far as entering the United States is concerned, every one counts, in the 3 per cent, except commercial travelers or tourists or actors. Now, we find a peculiar condition. We find that during 1920 245,000 visés were granted in Italy. Under this proviso 40,294 would come into this country. In regard to Poland and Russia combined they granted approximately 44,000 visés during the entire year 1920. If we take the entire country of Russia, with the little Georgian Republics, the Baltic Republics, and Poland combined, the total number coming to this country would be 51,000. Now, I shall insert this report, because it is the only one that has been gathered together up to this time.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. SIEGEL. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. What relation does he make relative to the number of visés that have been granted and those persons who have been admitted into the United States as immigrant cases?

Mr. SIEGEL. I do not think the gentleman states it very clearly.

Mr. RAKER. What effect can it have on the legislation as to the number of visés to immigrants in 1920?

Mr. SIEGEL. You mean the difference in number, or increase of numbers? Let me explain. The effect is as follows: If we take the number of visés, that shows the number of people that ostensibly can come to this country in one year, and my second table shows the number that could come in under the 3 per cent proposition.

On that question I quote further—

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again? I yield to the gentleman a minute, for a question, out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California yields to the gentleman from New York one minute.

Mr. RAKER. It would not make any difference, would it, as to the number of visés granted in the foreign countries—as to the number that might be admitted into the United States?

Mr. SIEGEL. If the 3 per cent provision is in effect?

Mr. RAKER. If any provision is in effect.

Mr. SIEGEL. It would. The State Department at this hour controls the number who can come into the United States through its control of the visé system. It determines each month how many people shall come from Poland, how many shall come from Italy, and from each of the other countries. As evidence of that, I say to you there came a limited number each month from Poland. In Italy 245,000 visés were granted inside of a year, and for the whole of Poland, which took in Lithuania and other countries, only 44,000 visés. The reports of the State Department show that 98 per cent of the people who came from Poland were parents, women, children, and other relatives coming here to join their families. That is the proposition. The report, at page 11, gives the exact proportions of each.

Mr. HUSTED rose.

Mr. SIEGEL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HUSTED. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. As a matter of fact, does he consider the Jews of Poland as subjects of religious persecution?

Mr. SIEGEL. There is a difference of opinion about that.

Mr. HUSTED. Is it not generally considered by the Jews in the United States that all of the Jews in Poland are subjects of persecution at this time?

Mr. SIEGEL. The State Department, whose report the chairman of the committee placed in this committee report, used the word "oppression" in reference to that situation. I want to say this, however, that so far as Poland is concerned, Poland is making every effort at the present time to stabilize conditions. It admits that there has been persecution, but it is trying to change conditions. But only 14 people were admitted in eight months under the same provision which we now find in the law. That conditions are deplorable over there we all know.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I want to know and be advised about this: Are they having pogroms over in that country now?

Mr. SIEGEL. Well, according to the reports, they say yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Well, that is religious persecution, is it not?

Mr. SIEGEL. It is very difficult for me to answer that question. When I offered that amendment in the committee it was intended to apply to all creeds and nationalities.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes; I know that.

Mr. SIEGEL. I want to say that that was my motive in offering it originally in 1916, when the present law was under consideration. The Armenians were bitterly persecuted then. The 1917 act carries on its pages, and on nearly every page, amendments to the bill, which I helped to perfect. I consider it a masterpiece of immigration law, and its provisions have been copied by Canada and other countries.

Now, I use the language that the State Department uses, and I will state also that I did not think and do not think now that it was advisable to issue that statement, because Poland is struggling very hard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Well, now, how about that? If a newspaper in one of these places in Poland—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. SIEGEL. I yield to my chairman, although this is taking up my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If a newspaper published in one of these Polish cities, such as Der Emigrant, published under the authority of an official society, issues the statement—

Mr. SIEGEL. One moment. I want to emphasize very strongly that the organization of the Hebrew Sheltering and Aid Society has nothing to do with the publication of that paper, either directly or indirectly. It is a private enterprise, published by itself—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. For the benefit of those who are trying to become immigrants into the United States?

Mr. SIEGEL. No. That is an ordinary newspaper, published in that city. It has nothing to do with any organization or any association. That organization publishes no newspaper at any time in any language.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Under this bill there are 51,974 immigrants permitted from Russia?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman, as a member of the committee, know how many immigrants would be permitted from what is now Poland? I am interested in two classes of immigrants, the native Pole and the Polish Jew. I would like to know how the immigration from the present Poland would be affected.

Mr. SIEGEL. It would be practically on the 3 per cent basis. The best calculation one could make would be that you would receive about 35,000 people a year, although there are about 40,000 applications at Warsaw alone right now for the whole of Poland, because we have no other consulate in that country.

Mr. HILL. What I wanted to get was this: Out of the 51,974 credited to the Russia of 1910 has it been approximated how many could come from Russian Poland?

Mr. SIEGEL. It is all approximation, but we are trying to get the facts.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that under the provision adopting the 1910 census it is impossible for anybody to say how many would come?

Mr. SIEGEL. That is true. Now, I would say—

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. The gentleman has stated that the State Department has discriminated against Poland in the interest of other countries.

Mr. SIEGEL. I have not stated that they discriminated. I do contend, however, they have not given her the same deal. I have given the facts simply as they are. I have not used the word "discriminate."

Mr. KINDRED. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's attitude in this measure. Does he regard that as a violation on the part of the State Department of the existing immigration law?

Mr. SIEGEL. I personally think it is a violation of what Congress understood when it passed the visé law. I have repeatedly said so, and I repeat it now. Now, on page 12 of this report of the committee, which I hold in my hand, I find this:

The political unrest in Poland is driving many emigrants to other lands. Bolshevik disorders, oppression, and the policy of the Government itself are all contributing factors.

Warsaw.—Extracts from articles appearing in the press of Warsaw show that propaganda favoring unrestricted immigration is contemplated. According to these articles this spring great celebrations will take place in New York with a view to showing in what measure immigrants took part in the general development of the country. A great exhibition will be opened, in which different races will take part. The exhibition will attempt to prove that America has profited more from the immigrant than the immigrant from America.

Now, there are many other things in these so-called dispatches which have been edited and doctored by certain officials before they became public, and it is a remarkable thing, when you look through this report here of these extracts, that you do not find references made to other countries from whence larger immigration came here during 1920 than came from Poland. I call attention right now to the fact that in the report to Congress in the Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, when the bill was reported, similar extracts were offered. I leave it to every man in the House to make his own deductions and his own inferences therefrom.

Now, there has been some discussion here as to whether the 1920 census will be ready so that we can act upon it. I say authoritatively right now that the 1920 census figures giving the foreign-born population will be ready before the end of this week. A letter was written to me on the 15th of April

by the acting director, telling me they would be ready by the middle of this week. This letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, April 15, 1921.

Hon. ISAAC SIEGEL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SIEGEL: We hoped to be able to furnish you the statistics you desire in regard to the foreign-born population of the United States by the close of this week, but unforeseen difficulties have developed, and I now find it will be impossible for us to give them to you before the middle or latter part of next week. Certainly they will be in your possession by not later than the 23d instant.

Trusting that this will answer your requirements, I am,
Very truly,

W. M. STEUART, Acting Director.

This morning there was delivered to me a statement containing the figures for a certain number of States, and they embodied the countries, localities, and places to which reference has been made here.

They are as follows:

Country of birth of foreign-born white for certain States, 1920.

	Alabama.	Arizona.	Arkansas.	Delaware.
Total foreign-born white....	17,662	78,099	13,975	19,810
England.....	1,942	2,882	1,137	1,497
Scotland.....	975	595	316	411
Wales.....	145	192	90	44
Ireland.....	809	1,206	676	2,895
Norway.....	215	337	99	65
Sweden.....	748	859	331	316
Denmark.....	191	398	180	77
Belgium.....	73	60	94	24
France (including Alsace-Lorraine).....	616	394	387	198
Luxemburg.....	8	22	8	5
Netherlands.....	83	69	116	37
Switzerland.....	174	293	736	76
Germany.....	2,427	1,516	3,979	1,632
Poland.....	394	261	529	3,847
Austria.....	585	484	615	615
Hungary.....	372	212	108	226
Czechoslovakia.....	232	148	491	122
Jugo-Slavia.....	155	1,167	117	25
Ruthenia.....			1	
Russia.....	1,582	816	662	2,244
Finland.....	74	407	18	52
Lithuania.....	12	16	27	90
Portugal.....	4	30	4	18
Spain.....	70	1,013	22	142
Italy.....	2,732	1,261	1,314	4,136
Greece.....	915	329	277	286
Bulgaria.....	18	28	17	
Rumania.....	120	51	62	110
Turkey, Europe.....	22	93	1	3
Other Europe.....	31	14	11	9
Asia.....	575	397	253	27
Africa.....	23	22	16	9
Australia.....	21	81	25	12
Canada, French.....	52	90	58	23
Canada, other.....	840	1,872	822	423
Newfoundland.....	3	16	20	8
Cuba and other West Indies ¹	201	41	15	28
Mexico.....	132	60,242	259	50
Central America.....	38	16	1	5
South America.....	27	56	22	10
Atlantic Islands.....	7	1	4	1
Pacific Islands.....	5	26	7	6
At sea.....	11	21	26	7
Country not specified.....	3	65	1	

	District of Columbia.	Florida.	Georgia.	Indiana.
Total foreign-born white....	28,548	43,008	16,186	150,868
England.....	2,990	4,451	1,593	8,522
Scotland.....	793	1,068	530	3,707
Wales.....	103	136	86	1,103
Ireland.....	4,320	1,304	1,112	7,271
Norway.....	219	610	132	544
Sweden.....	481	1,399	299	4,942
Denmark.....	237	575	127	930
Belgium.....	76	130	45	2,530
France (including Alsace-Lorraine).....	687	731	376	3,247
Luxemburg.....	13	24	7	101
Netherlands.....	127	357	78	2,018
Switzerland.....	358	357	161	2,334
Germany.....	3,382	3,534	1,933	37,377
Poland.....	716	428	917	17,791
Austria.....	525	525	401	9,099
Hungary.....	219	383	246	9,352
Czechoslovakia.....	122	189	123	3,934
Jugo-Slavia.....	43	88	84	4,471
Ruthenia.....				7
Russia.....	5,181	1,243	3,452	7,673
Finland.....	104	311	42	237
Lithuania.....	38	13	72	1,445
Portugal.....	11	223	39	14
Spain.....	108	4,091	123	467
Italy.....	3,764	4,745	700	6,712
Greece.....	1,207	1,408	1,473	4,103
Bulgaria.....	5	16	5	431
Rumania.....	86	472	111	2,731

¹Except Porto Rico.

Country of birth of foreign-born white for certain States, 1920—Contd.

	District of Columbia.	Florida.	Georgia.	Indiana.
Turkey, Europe.....	72	6	21	70
Other Europe.....	25	25	61	149
Asia.....	382	672	586	1,256
Africa.....	46	54	22	37
Australia.....	25	57	26	77
Canada, French.....	147	277	50	405
Canada, other.....	1,541	3,844	905	4,690
Newfoundland.....	18	75	22	44
Cuba and other West Indies ¹	114	8,700	89	51
Mexico.....	65	158	53	661
Central America.....	51	94	1	11
South America.....	103	113	43	69
Atlantic Islands.....	7	81	9	7
Pacific Islands.....	6	12	8	26
At sea.....	16	27	11	133
Country not specified.....	12	3	9	43

¹Except Porto Rico.

There is no reason in the world why the 1920 census should not be taken. If it is prejudice, if it is bigotry, if it is hatred, then let us understand it once for all and let us face it, so that the American people may understand thoroughly what is behind this legislation. If it is American legislation, then adopt the census of 1920. When you called the boys to arms under the selective draft law you did not use the census of 1910. You called them under the latest figures which were obtainable at that time, and put the burden upon those States where there were foreign-born people.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. No; I decline to yield further unless the gentleman will give me some time.

Now, there has been repeated discussion here by the chairman of the Committee on Immigration in regard to naturalization. In the first place, on page 8 of a speech delivered by him on the 14th of January, he said that four States—Wisconsin, Indiana, Missouri, and Texas—allowed people to vote without becoming citizens. I assume that he referred to Arkansas instead of Wisconsin. The people of Wisconsin have been protesting to me about the matter.

On page 9 of the same speech he said:

Four hundred thousand young aliens waived all rights of their own and fought with our troops and the troops of the Allies. We have offered to make citizens of every one, and rightly so. To put on Uncle Sam's uniform, to be willing to die for a country which has not yet adopted one, must be regarded as the supreme test of citizenship.

I agree with him most heartily that it is the test by which to judge these men as to their devotion and love to our country.

Now let us see. Away back in 1910 the census figures showed that there were approximately 13,515,886 foreign-born people in this country who had not become citizens, and since that time about 1,500,000 have become citizens, and when they became citizens it meant that their wives and children also became citizens. In addition thereto there must be considered the number who died since 1910. We gave to our Army and Navy from the entire country 4,600,000 men. The foreign-born population were approximately 10 to 12 per cent. There are 400,000 men who waived exemption and went in to fight for Uncle Sam when they were not required to do it, proving conclusively that they appreciated the benefits and opportunities they found here. That is a test of citizenship, and they have demonstrated to you their fitness.

Who is responsible for the failure of many people to become naturalized citizens of this country? This Congress right here is responsible. You have neglected and failed in every instance to provide sufficient courts and clerks. At this very moment 24,000 cases are ready for final hearing in New York alone, and we have not the judges and the clerks to handle those cases, and they are increasing every day to the number of 400. The same thing is true in Chicago, where there are a little over 10,000 cases pending. The clerk of the United States district court of New York in a letter which he wrote to the Attorney General, and which I will insert in the RECORD, very aptly showed that it is of no use to accept more applications if you do not provide the judges, and that the judges can not hear any more cases than they are hearing at the present time. They set one day in the week in the United States court and, of course, it is limited to that number.

The clerk of the court in this letter to the Attorney General says:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
CLERK'S OFFICE,
DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,
New York City, April 8, 1921.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

Sir: In reply to your telegram of March 31 last, requesting the views of this office as to the necessity of appointing two additional

assistants to care for naturalization matters in this court, I have the honor to advise you as follows:

It is so easy for the alien public and as well those of our citizenry who have become interested in naturalization matters to lose sight of the fact that the filing of a petition for naturalization is merely the means to an end and that this end is accomplished only upon the final hearing had.

The number of petitions which can be filed in the clerk's office is, of course, limited only by the number of clerks employed, but the accomplishment of the alien's purpose, namely, to become a citizen, is fulfilled only through the action of a judge of the court. It follows, therefore, that the number of aliens that can be naturalized depends upon the number of judges who have time to give to naturalization hearings. The judges of this court have been consulted in this matter and they are convinced that they can give no more time to naturalization matters than they have been giving, so that it seems that to employ more naturalization assistants in the naturalization bureau of this office would be a useless expenditure of public funds.

There are now pending in this court upward of 2,500 petitions, 1,200 of which are pending cases of enemy aliens, which will be disposed of en bloc the first week in June next. The remaining will be heard on the regular hearing days, which are had once every week, which means that the court keeps abreast of its calendars, but it can do no more, especially when it is considered that in the six months ending March 31 last there were pending cases as follows:

Equity	224
Law	764
Admiralty	1,000
Information in cases under selective service act	7,500
Other criminal cases	1,458

Very respectfully,

ALEX GILCHRIST, Jr., Clerk.

Now, of course, our supreme court judges are sitting a week every month and an additional judge will sit for at least three weeks between now and July.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SIEGEL. I certainly will.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. How do these conditions compare with similar conditions prior to the war? Did the war stimulate applications for citizenship?

Mr. SIEGEL. The war undoubtedly has stimulated the applications for citizenship and made men, regardless of age, realize that they have no right to remain in this country unless they determine to become American citizens as quickly as possible.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Can the gentleman state what percentage of aliens who served in the armed forces of the United States took advantage of the special act which we passed permitting them to become naturalized?

Mr. SIEGEL. We passed that act in 1918, and a large number of these men had gone over to the other side at that time. Of those who were in this country I think 260,000 applied for citizenship. One of the objections raised by the men who returned was that each one of these men must pay \$4 in order to become a citizen, although he risked life and limb in our defense.

Mr. KINDRED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. How much time have I used, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 19 minutes.

Mr. SIEGEL. I yield to the gentleman for a brief question.

Mr. KINDRED. The gentleman has called attention very aptly to the inadequate machinery with which to deal with aliens who desire to be naturalized. I would like to ask the gentleman in that same connection if he has investigated personally—I presume he has—the conditions in Warsaw? Conditions there would seem to indicate that if adequate machinery were provided very much less injustice would be done to the aliens who are waiting there to come to this country.

Mr. SIEGEL. I admit that. I will say this to you gentlemen, that never before in our history have we enacted a law and provided an insufficient force of men to handle the work, although from this visé system we have made a profit to the United States Government over and above the appropriations of a little over \$10,000,000. From what I hear, our consul at Warsaw, Mr. Leo J. Keena, is doing the best he can with his limited force.

We have turned this visé law into a money-making revenue proposition, instead of using the money for the purposes for which it was originally intended that it should be used. The great Government of the United States appropriates the sum of \$100,000 for Americanization work, although naturalization alone has brought in over \$800,000 and immigration has brought in over \$6,000,000 above all appropriations.

Now, I hold in my hand a composition on Col. Theodore Roosevelt. The prize winner lives in my congressional district. The boy was 15 months in America and 12 years of age when he wrote it. I say right now that none of us can possibly point to any other boy of that age who has so energetically devoted himself to getting an understanding of our institutions and the lives and biography of our great men as this boy has done. It

is the most remarkable piece of school work that I have ever seen. It is as follows:

[William Marconi School, public school 85 Man., 346 E. 117th St., New York.]

G. A.

Lessons from Roosevelt's life.

December 10, 1920.

P. S. No. 85 Man.

Salvatore Montenero.

G. A.

OUTLINE.

Birthplace and boyhood.

After life.

What he stood for.

Lessons he left to boys.

His end.

Theodore Roosevelt was born October 27, 1858, at 28 East 20th St., city of New York. He was the son of a merchant descendant from the Dutch. He was a very delicate boy, but became a very strong and powerful man by taking constant exercise. He loved to read, was brave, honest, and did many brilliant things for his country, which he dearly loved. He was honorary vice president of the Boy Scouts of America, lovingly known to them as "Teddy." Not only these boys, but all boys, can learn from his example to be industrious, honest, thrifty, and determined to conquer every difficulty that may come in their way.

He received his early education in the public schools of New York and later graduated from Harvard University. He was a New York City assemblyman, member of the U. S. Civil Commission, president of police commission of New York City, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, colonel of the "Rough Riders" during the Spanish-American War, governor of New York State, and the youngest Vice President and President that the United States of America ever had. He conducted a hunting expedition in Africa and South America and was the author of many books. In later years he was "contributing editor" to the Outlook.

Roosevelt stood for a square deal for everybody, for punishment for all enemies of the Government. He encouraged people to govern themselves. He loved nature, animals, and children.

Roosevelt left his thoughts with the American boys when he said, "Of course what we have to expect of the American boy is that he shall be a good American man. Now, the chances are strong that he won't be much of a man unless he is a good deal of a boy. He must not be a coward or a weakling, a bully, a shirk, or a prig. He must work hard and play hard. He must be clean-minded and clean-lived, and able to hold his own under all circumstances and against all comers. It is only on these conditions that he will grow into the kind of a man of whom America will be really proud."

This lover of his fellow men had four sons, and he encouraged them all to fight in the great World War of 1914, and received with grief, but proudly, the news that one of them had given his life for his country. He did not live long after the death of his son in France. He died early in the morning of January 6, 1919, the greatest proved and most loved American of our generation.

The reason why I point to this composition is because it is repeatedly said that the boys grow up and do not become Americans. Our committee has been to New York and has seen the schools, and they know of the great work our teachers and pupils are doing. The reason that I make the reference is that in another one of these dispatches before you from the State Department, and which is false and untrue, is the following:

Extracts from articles appearing in the press of Warsaw show that propaganda favoring unrestricted immigration is contemplated. According to these articles, this spring great celebrations will take place in New York with a view to showing in what measure immigrants took part in the general development of the country. A great exhibition will be opened in which different races will take part. The exhibition will attempt to prove that America has profited more from the immigrant than the immigrant from America.

Gentlemen, read between the lines and decide for yourselves whether you could trust any such authority to send a dispatch of that kind. What is the truth of the proposition? In our schools in New York we teach history as follows: We take a certain period of the country and we have the children learn its full details, not merely by rote, by reading it, but by proceeding to get up a play, and the members of the committee who were with us saw the history of the country up to date in school 83, and all remarked that it was a favorable and wonderful piece of work. Speaker GILLET commended the boys' orchestra at this school. They saw the work in school 72 and other schools at the same time. That goes on in every school in the city of New York. There are no exceptions, and we take great pride in that work. There is not a scintilla of truth in that dispatch. If that is a criterion by which we are to judge the rest of the information, I am very sorry that we have people employed in the State Department who are imbued with certain perverted ideas so that they send out stuff of that kind to be used in the Congress of the United States.

Now, there has been something said in regard to disease of immigrants in New York. I hold in my hand the statistics of the Census Bureau, which I got yesterday. That contains the record of Greater New York, it shows 13 plus out of 1,000 every year of people who pass away of all kinds of diseases. We have fought the battle of reducing the death rate and we have won. We have brought it down from 18 out of 1,000, and I think that record is as good as any other part of the country having anywhere near an equal population with us. We are not worried; we are not frightened. We fought the Spanish influenza in the camps around New York and we won. Because five or six cases of disease appear on a ship arriving at New York every effort is made to get our people unnerved. What is the object?

Propaganda; nothing else except propaganda. Spread the report that New York is threatened with disease and thus push through a restrictive immigration bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Did not the commissioner of health of New York come to Congress and appeal for money?

Mr. SIEGEL. The health commissioner came to me and said that the island had been taken under the jurisdiction of the United States and they required \$200,000. I asked him why he came to me. He said, "Because you were responsible for getting the Federal Government, with the assistance of Mr. Magee, of Syracuse, to take over the quarantine station in New York, and now it is up to you to get \$200,000." I told him to leave it to the Public Health Service of the Federal Government, for they were in charge. I had him talk to both my colleague, Mr. MAGEE, and to our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. GOOP, of Iowa. That conditions are bad at Hoffman Island are fully shown in the following statement by one of our ex-service men, who served in the war. It was dictated by him, as follows:

ACCOMMODATIONS AT HOFFMAN ISLAND.

On the *Lancaster*, where the crew of the *Mongolian* quartered, no sheets on the bed, no running water, no bathing of any kind, water distributed to the crew in cans only, the toilets are not flushed, and the lighting system very poor.

The quarters where the immigrants are stationed at Hoffman Island is divided into two parts: the men and women are separated; the men sleep in one section and the women and children in another. There are no chairs or benches, so the immigrants sit on their beds. There is no place for them to wash their clothes; they borrow buckets here and there in order to keep their clothes clean and dry them on lines which they fix up themselves. Telephone service was very inadequate and outgoing calls could only be obtained by explaining that it was very urgent and that some immediate member of your family was either seriously sick or dying.

No amusements, no Jewish services for the members of that religion. Post-office service very poor; could not send a registered letter out. There are no park benches on the outside, although there is ample space for them if furnished.

Immigrants have a hard time to bathe themselves, as hot water is very scarce.

Passengers sent to be deloused are kept waiting for their meals. Passengers were put to bed on board the *Lancaster* before they were given a bath. The employees are given a position, whether they are citizens or not, because most of them do not speak the English language.

The crew of the *Mongolia*, which did not include the officers—some are licensed officers and some are not—did not go to Hoffman Island, but they roamed around New York City.

The dining room is run by a Miss Osbourne, dietitian; the metal plate was dirty and wet and greasy. I called her attention to it, and she blamed it on the washing machine. The tin cups from which we drank our coffee were rusty. There is no canteen on the island, and cigarettes and newspapers are hard to get.

The reason that the *Mongolia* was put in quarantine was that one case of typhus was discovered, an 8-year-old girl, at Boston, where the passengers were quarantined.

Mr. KINDRED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. May I interrupt the gentleman a moment to suggest that the board of health in the city of New York has done eminently efficient work throughout many years, and that it was only because of conflict of authority between State and Federal power that the commissioner of health of the city of New York yielded to the national authority in this matter?

Mr. SIEGEL. Let me say this about the commissioner: He understands now the difference between city power, State power, and Federal power. He and I are not quarreling about the proposition, I can assure you. We know how hard it is to get anything for New York.

To show you how the visé system works, let me say that here is a boy who went to the other side; he was a little over 15 years of age. He was in 14 actions, and on the 2d day of August, 1918, he was gassed in action. Two other brothers were in the service. The widowed mother was over on the other side; they tried to bring her here before the war, but did not succeed. She wrote to a cousin of hers. She did not know what had happened to the boys, but she had traveled 400 miles afoot to make her way to get through. She writes as follows:

CHISINAU, RUMANIA.

TO MY BEST BELOVED: I beg of you to learn where the family of Archango are. Are they in the city where they used to be? It is now four months since I am on the way. I have written letters and have received no answer. I wander about in the synagogues. I beg of you to find my children as quickly as possible, and have them come to bring me, their mother. If it is not possible for one of them to come, send some one over to bring me. I hope that you are all well. Lovingly,

The second letter reads as follows:

CHISINAU, RUMANIA.

DEAR FRIEND: I have written to you that I have arrived in Kishinev. It is very bad off with me. I have nothing with which to exist, even for a day. How is it for me to have had eight children and to have fallen as low as I have?

It is an unforgivable sin for one not to come from America to bring me. It is three months now since I have heard from my children. I have not had a warm meal for the last three months. I have nothing with which to buy it. I sleep at nights in the synagogues. Send me help as quickly as possible.

Both of these letters were addressed to cousins, as, apparently, the addresses of her children had not been known to the mother, who appears to have been wandering from place to place.

This woman is over 60 years of age, and although three of her boys were in the service she could not get a visé to come over here. At last I said to one of the boys, "You go over there yourself," and we were finally able to obtain a passport for him a few days ago and he has started on the way.

I will tell you another story that will interest Col. HILL, of Baltimore. He knows of a boy in Baltimore who has been in the service. He has tried to get his widowed mother and sister over here for four and a half months. He has been trying to get that visé during all of that time, and although a dispatch from the consul at Riga states that the papers were sent in January, yet the State Department insists that they never were sent on. This boy has been ground in between one side and the other, sending on every dollar that he could possibly make, and now finds himself in the position such as he is—here—with his widowed mother and young sister over there unable to get here. That is the result of your visé system. If I had the time I could point out to you numerous other cases. We put the visé system in force in time of war, when we said that it was necessary as a war measure in order to keep out all of the bolsheviks, if there were any. We all wanted to keep out every scoundrel that was opposed to our form of government. The trouble is that it has been perverted into the most cruel, unkind, and inhuman instrument that any government on the face of the earth or any legislative body throughout the world has ever enacted, because it is being used against innocent women and children. That is the story of the visé system.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The warm sympathy of the gentleman's heart is commendable, but is his sympathy for these people, who want to come here because of the necessities and who can not, greater than his sympathy for the several hundred thousand people in the United States who are now suffering because of the want of jobs?

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me answer the gentleman in this way: My life's record is an answer to him. Long before the gentleman ever held public office my civic work in New York City was well known. My record during the whole of that time is one of which I am proud. It is a record of service to my country, because I have considered men for what they are worth and what they consist of. And let me say to the gentleman also that on the very day when the reapportionment bill was under consideration the gentleman himself went to New York on a very busy purpose, and that particular subject we will discuss at some other time.

Mr. BLANTON. I was trying to help out the conditions that exist there now with reference to bread lines.

Mr. SIEGEL. There are no bread lines in New York at this hour. We have a number of strikes in New York, and there is a big strike now as to whether or not men shall work 42 or 46 or 48 hours a week, and hundreds of thousands of men who are worth considerable money are out on strike. They are attending the theaters and the moving-picture houses, riding around in machines galore, and these men are not suffering. We have not a bread line in New York City.

Mr. BLANTON. Who is paying for all this?

Mr. SIEGEL. The gentleman is paying for it and I am paying for it—we are all paying for it. They all made money during the war, and they have the money to spend and are spending it. They want to work 42 hours a week, and the manufacturers say that the public at large, including the gentleman from Texas, that the people want clothing cheaper, and you can not have any clothing, ladies' suits, and furs cheaper if you are going to pay \$75 and \$85 a week for 42 hours' work. That is the answer to the proposition in New York, and any time my friend wants to look into it any further I should be very glad to answer his questions.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has not caught the question yet. The question is, Is the gentleman for the necessities of this country first or for the necessities of Europe first?

Mr. SIEGEL. I want to say to the gentleman once more that I once said on the floor of this House that the gentleman from Texas could ask more questions and give less information than any man in the House. The House agreed with me then, and the House has agreed with me ever since, including the entire delegation from Texas. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. It depends entirely upon the viewpoint.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. HILL. In reference to the case the gentleman mentions, I want to say that is not the only case. There are at least a dozen cases of that kind that I know of that I am working on, where the wives and families of soldiers can not be gotten to this country. There has been something said about Italy. Let me quote the following:

Italy is so beautiful, it is so rich in the treasures of art and the glories of nature, it is so gemmed and jeweled by the hand of man and the hand of God, it is altogether so exquisite and delectable, that it is not easy to treat it quite like the rest of this hard, prosaic, practical, materialistic, latter-day Europe. For generations Italy has been the chosen haunt of the sentimental traveler, the paradise of the literary and artistic holiday maker. It is the Italy of Byron and Shelley, of Goethe and Heine, of Stendhal and George Sand, of Landor and Browning, that we know best, the Italy of the pictures and the palaces and the Vatican galleries, the Italy of the purple hills and sapphire seas; the land of song and music and verse, the "woman country" that inspires her alien lovers with an undying passion.

"Open my heart and you shall see
Graved upon it Italy."

Yes; but the Italy of the past, the Italy of a dream—of many dreams. (From Italy in the War, by Sidney Low, pp. 4, 5.)

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I could go on and discuss this subject much longer. Debate is limited, and there are others who desire to speak. I think I have made as good a study of Ellis Island as any man ever has. I have studied this immigration proposition, and I say to you that if we enforce our law we will have no difficulty. We can not enforce our law until we provide proper appropriations; and when we do we will have no problem on our hands. There is none except in the minds of the prejudiced, skillful agitator, who every year and every month is excited over the immigration question. It has become a part of his existence. He sees red everywhere he turns. It is his hobby in life. Put an Assistant Secretary of Labor at Ellis Island and let him pass on these appeals. Provide sufficient money for these inspectors and enforce our amendments which were put into the act of 1917 and we will have no complaint.

Let us proceed and provide sufficient courts and judges, and we will have no trouble about naturalization. Let us face the question squarely. Let us look at it in the way it should be looked at. Let us analyze it as it should be analyzed, and let us not be carried away by oratory which waves the American flag all of the time. I, too, could have been a major in the Army, and have trotted around here in a uniform if I had wanted such a distinction. My then colleague, Mr. LaGuardia, who is at present the president of the Board of Aldermen of New York, came to me and said, "Shall I go on the other side, and will you look after my matters here?" I answered him yes, that he could go. In the summer of 1918 I went over to the other side as the chairman of the overseas commission, and whether there was a battle on or otherwise, I went where I could do the most good.

I was married and had a family, too, and yet I did not come back and deliver speeches about it broadcast, because I recognized, as I have said, from boyhood, everywhere that the person who is a citizen of the United States, whether native or foreign born, owes everything he possesses to our country, and when the emergency comes, it is his duty to do his most and utmost for our common country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE].

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think every man in this room must have felt touched by the very eloquent appeal just made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] in behalf of the unfortunate people in central Europe who are waiting for a chance to get over here. I know I was so touched. The letter appearing on page 5 of this report, signed by the Assistant Secretary of State, is a letter which was addressed to me. It concerns a family in my district who have been endeavoring to get over here. They are good people, but notice what the Assistant Secretary says, under date of April 5, that there are 40,000 aliens in Warsaw alone desirous of making application for American visés. I agree entirely that for people who are entitled to come there ought to be some more speedy and humane way of permitting them to come. But, gentlemen, what in the world has all this proposition to do with the matter of who should be entitled to come? That is the question we are arguing here to-day. We are discussing a mat-

ter which is vital to the American Nation, a question involving our national ideals and our national history, the stock from which Americans in the future are to be made. Of course, if we admit only half the number which might be admitted under this bill we should still furnish the means to admit them promptly and avoid this hardship, but the question is aside from the one we are discussing. I call attention, however, to a fact that exposes the singular inconsistency in the position of the minority. They argue in their report that there are very few coming, and in the same breath they get up and tell us how pitiful it is, and it is pitiful, that there are so many now who want to come who can not get visés. In the city of Warsaw alone, one city in central Europe, 40,000 are waiting. That would put that city alone in the third place among the countries whose people could come to the United States under this bill.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAILE. I will.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Does the gentleman realize that 40,000 seeking visés in Warsaw means that it would take 340 days for the State Department's representatives there to visé those 40,000 respective immigrants?

Mr. VAILE. Not quite that, according to the report.

Mr. ROSSDALE. The State Department in a letter to me tells me that they can only visé 250 a day, and 40,000 would make 240 days for those 40,000 immigrants alone to get visés; where is the flood coming from?

Mr. VAILE. The letter says in the month of September. But how is the gentleman hurt in that case? No more would be admitted, anyway, without this legislation. On page 19 of the minority report they say there arrived in the year ending April 1, 1921, 652,000 aliens; during the same period 336,000 left here. On that calculation the remainder who could come without this bill would be only about the number who would be admitted under this bill.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Does the gentleman mean to say it is fair to say that our Government shall install a system that compels an immigrant—

Mr. VAILE. I have expressly stated I do not think it is fair to require these visés in this manner.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Then why make it worse by a bill of this kind?

Mr. VAILE. I can not see how this bill makes it worse. But what we are discussing is the question of a policy of who shall be admitted to the United States. Now I want to address myself—

Mr. SIEGEL. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. VAILE. Very well.

Mr. SIEGEL. The gentleman understands that Warsaw covers a portion of Lithuania?

Mr. VAILE. I assume that it covers a great many people outside of that one city.

Mr. SIEGEL. It covers the entire population of—

Mr. VAILE. Suppose it covered the whole of Poland?

Mr. SIEGEL. We have a consul at Warsaw for the whole of that territory, while every other country has dozens.

Mr. VAILE. I hope the gentleman understands that I have expressed the view that our facilities over there should be better, and I hope the business will be dispatched more promptly.

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAILE. I will.

Mr. TEMPLE. Many of those from Lithuania go to Riga as well as Warsaw and their passports are viséed at Riga. The report from the consul at Riga, which is contained on page 12 of the majority report, points out the class of Letts and Lithuanians who are leaving—

Mr. VAILE. I can not yield further. How much time have I consumed, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed eight minutes.

Mr. VAILE. There is one argument which I do want in these few minutes that remain to call to the attention of the House, and it is an argument that is frequently presented before the committee. It is presented on the floor of the House every time the question comes up. And that is that we should loosen the restrictions of immigration because we need labor. That is presented by people who represent almost every conceivable kind of interests. We have had before our committee delegations of cotton growers from the Southwest and wheat growers from the Middle West, and of clothing manufacturers and of building trades from New York and other large cities. We have had organizations presenting the same argument, such as the Interracial Council closely identified with the Association of Foreign Language Newspapers and financed to a considerable extent, at least, by large manufacturers, among them Du Pont, the great powder king.

On the other hand, those whom my friend speaks of as "eloquent propagandists," who are in favor of enforcing strictly the present immigration laws and of tightening the restrictions, are for the most part—I might say entirely—people who have no personal interest to be served by tightening the restrictions. These people, patriotic societies, and patriotic individuals, are doing their work practically without means. But these people, guardians of the public weal, moved by no self-interest, have presented the American argument that we should preserve American ideals in morals, law, and government, and they have no financial interests of their own to serve. Of course, there are also some on the other side who are not moved by self-interest but by humanitarian sentiments, such as my friends here in the House.

Now, let us examine the arguments a little.

I readily concede that many of the delegations appearing before us in behalf of particular industrial or agricultural interests made very forcible arguments for the necessity of additional labor in those industries. They presented overwhelming figures, they made a very compelling appeal for the prosperity of particular districts largely dependent upon the prosperity of particular industries, and they pressed home the argument that we need increased production especially at the present time to relieve high prices and to restore normal economic conditions throughout the country.

These are strong considerations. They are addressed both to our national interest and to our local interest. Certainly, as a general proposition, increased national production is of vital importance to the whole country, and increased local production is of vital importance to your own district. But if increased production of goods could only be secured by reduction of Americanism, by lowering our standards of living, by replacing the English language with a medley of other tongues, by substituting for American communities polyglot colonies where our Constitution and laws are neither respected nor understood, by changing the character of our race—then production is bought at too great a cost. When the cost is in dollars and cents we feel it, but, after all, we can pay it. The other cost we could not pay, for in paying it the American Nation would lose its soul. [Applause.]

Let me say to my friends of my own party: We are advocating a tariff to protect American industry. We argue justly and truly that this means primarily the protection of American labor. But if we erect a tariff wall to keep the underpaid labor of foreign countries from competing in foreign factories and on foreign farms with well-paid and self-respecting American labor, and if at the same time we let the foreign labor in to compete with our people, in their own yard, the American workingman would have a perfect right to complain that our tariff was made to protect the employer and not the employee and that our platform promises were a fraud and a snare.

Now, here is an interesting thought culled from the testimony of those who have appeared before us demanding foreign labor for their industries. It is that they need an ever renewed crop because the second generation will not work under the same conditions or for the same wage.

If we are to adopt the policy of increasing or even maintaining our production by a never-ending supply of foreign labor we enter a vicious circle from which we never can escape.

I believe that other ways can be found of increasing the production of our farms and factories. But if increased immigration is the only way, then, in my judgment, we would better get along as best we can without the increased production.

But, gentlemen, we are now proposing a temporary restriction of immigration. Those who argue that we need more hands in our industry must therefore prove that we need them now, at the present day, during the short period that this bill is to be in operation. The figures completely disprove any such contention.

There has been a steady increase of unemployment in most though not all parts of the United States during the past year, and it is very marked to-day.

The Department of Labor has prepared tabulated figures from 65 industrial centers based on the actual pay rolls of 1,424 firms, which, in January, 1920, employed 9,402,000 people. In January, 1921, these same firms employed only 8,070,648 people, a decrease during the year of 36.9 per cent. The 65 industrial centers are in every part of the country and are located in 27 of the 48 States. They include nearly every class of productive industry except farming, which is treated separately, namely, (1) metals and metal products, machinery, electric goods, and foundry products; (2) the building trades; (3) packing-house and food products; (4) textile products, clothing, hosiery, and underwear; (5) boots and shoes, leather and leather products; (6) automobiles and accessories; (7) house furniture, boxes,

lumber and lumber products; (8) clay, glass, cement, and stone products.

The Labor Department in addition to the pay rolls of these 1,424 firms in 65 industrial centers has data sufficient upon which to base an estimate of the unemployment in a total of 182 industrial centers, having an aggregate population of 32,560,953 under the 1920 census. That comprises nearly one-third of the whole people of the United States. Well, the estimated unemployment among that population of thirty-two and one-half millions was 1,802,755 in January. In other words, three months ago in 182 cities and towns, comprising practically one-third of the United States, 54 per cent of the people were out of employment. This is a heavy economic burden for any community, and it means much individual suffering and privation.

And since January this condition has grown worse. Taking the pay rolls of the 1,424 firms, which I think must be regarded as fairly indicative of the whole, while some firms and some cities reported an increase of employment in February, the net result in that month was a decrease of 15,523, or 1 per cent. In March the net result showed a further decrease of 24,825, or 1½ per cent. It will be observed not only that there was an increase in the total of unemployment but that there was a very alarming increase in the rate of increase. There was also an increase in the number of cities reporting worse conditions. Whereas in February 36 of the 65 cities reported a loss in employment, in March 44 of them so reported.

Of course, it is an ill wind, indeed, that blows nobody any good. Unemployment is driving many workers to the country, and for the first time in several seasons it looks as though it might be possible to secure some help on the farm in most parts of the country, though it is not for the most part very experienced farm help. This, however, will not be relieved by immigration, because the reports from the other side are well-nigh unanimous that it is not the farmers who are emigrating, but the city dwellers. The reports show that the farmers among immigrants are less than 3 per cent.

Now, it is possible that there may be a labor shortage in some particular industry in your own district. There is such a shortage in at least two of the principal industries in Colorado, for reasons which I will not now take time to discuss. But we are here to legislate for the whole United States of America. In the United States as a whole there is certainly no labor shortage. On the contrary, there is a great and growing shortage of jobs.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Will the gentleman explain to me at just this point? Do you think a measure of this kind, which implies that this country has reached a saturation point, that we have reached that point where we can no longer permit but a limited number of immigrants, is a better bill than one that would give us an intelligent distribution of immigration? Does not the gentleman believe there is enough of vacant land in these United States to support a population of two or three additional millions?

Mr. VAILE. Not without a great deal of expense in improving that vacant land. I come from a country where that so-called vacant land is located.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAILE. I ask for one minute more.

Mr. RAKER. I yield, Mr. Chairman, two minutes to the gentleman. If the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] will give him one, then he will have three.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. VAILE. I thank you both, gentlemen. All I have to say is this, that I have tried to refrain in these remarks from discussing what I consider the great controlling factors and considerations in immigration legislation, and those are the social, racial, and political questions. I have tried to limit myself to the discussion of the labor problem, and I merely want to say that if there ever was a time or if there may be a time when immigration should be let in in an increased amount on account of labor conditions, that time is not the present time, when American citizens are idle and American soldiers are walking the streets in search of work. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman yielded back any time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used his full two minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, history repeats itself. After every foreign war comes a resurgence of chauvinism. It is the scum that boils up out of the caldron of disorder, bloodshed, and national hatreds. As it came after the War of the Revolution, it was evidenced by hostility toward the aliens and strangers, by a drive against the freedom of speech, and by opposition toward many of the things for which our ancestors had laid down their lives. It was evidenced by the alien act of 1798 and by the sedition act of the same period, two measures which have come down in the history of our country as the cause of the utter defeat and destruction of the Federalist Party.

The same cause has produced the same effect to-day. During the recent Congress there was a determined effort to put over a strenuous prohibition on the freedom of expression of opinion, traditional in American life. The Sterling sedition bill passed the Senate and in the still more obnoxious form of the Graham bill was favorably reported by the Committee on the Judiciary of this House, and was placed on the calendar ready for passage. Perhaps it will be brought forward during the present Congress. Political considerations of a petty partisan nature—

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman will excuse me, if he please. I have only got a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Political considerations, based on the fear of the dominant party that the passage of that sedition measure would cause the condemnation of the American people to be visited upon them, even as the Federalists were condemned on account of the sedition act of 1798—that fear alone caused the failure to pass that bill.

We had during the last Congress several of these drives on aliens. During the last days of the Congress, under the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], who happened to be in a position of influence as conferee, a rider upon the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill was put over in this House which makes it necessary for any alien, before he may come to this country, to obtain a passport from his own Government and the visé of his passport by the Department of State. That was made a permanent law for the use of the present Republican administration. By means of that rider, fathered by Mr. ROGERS, an oppressive war law was made of permanent operation and lasting effect.

And I am reminded also that the drives against aliens and against freedom of speech which have characterized the backwash of war have not always had their origin and their entire support among the most patriotic elements of our people. They have not always come from those who are most concerned about the preservation of real Americanism. To the contrary, the alien and sedition laws of 1798 represented what was left of Tory sentiment in the United States, not the sentiment of the people who had won the Revolution, had fought for it at Lexington and Yorktown, but of those who cherished un-American ideals and believed that wealth and class and prestige should dominate this country and that the common people existed for no higher purpose than to maintain a privileged upper class.

The visé law to which I have referred is closely akin to the alien act of 1798. Under the latter the President could order to be deported any alien whom he might deem dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States. Under the visé law the President has still more arbitrary powers—he can prevent any man, woman, or child, whomsoever he chooses, from coming to the United States.

That law was passed originally as a war measure. It is not an immigration measure. It was not passed in the interest of keeping immigrants out of this country. It was passed originally under the guise of a war measure. Our Republican brethren went to the people of the United States and promised them that they would repeal the restrictive war laws. Yet we find, soon after the election, instead of repealing that law it was made permanent. A resolution repealing numerous war laws, including the passport control act, the visé law, was actually passed, but within a few days the visé law was again enacted as a permanent law. The pretense of redemption of the Republican campaign promise degenerated into a mere jest. They gave with the left hand and snatched it back with the right. The Republican majority is responsible for making this visé act a permanent law in the United States, with the absolute power in the hands of the President, delegated, of course, to the Secretary of State, and by him in turn delegated to numerous consular officers throughout the world, to say whether a particular alien may or may not come to America.

This measure that we have before us is just a political bluff. That is all that it is. It is merely a political bluff.

It purports to have effect for only 10 months, and in the meantime half of the expected immigration may come into this country. At the end of that period we all know that there will be the same rush to come to this country that there would be had this law not been passed. It will make no difference. It is merely a political bluff. We are fighting one of those sham battles that frequently occur in this House.

But that is not what I meant to talk about. I make no quarrel with the bill under consideration. I want to talk about the visé measure. I want to talk about the law which holds thousands of persons, who are entirely worthy to come to the United States under our immigration laws, outside the doors of our consular offices, and which forbids them even to take passage to come, although their admission is authorized by law, until they obtain the consul's visé.

I am in favor of proper and reasonable immigration laws. That is not the point. The point is that whatever laws are to control the admission of aliens should be passed by the Congress of the United States. Congress is the only law-making power that our Constitution recognizes. Congress ought not to have abdicated its sacred function. It ought not to have shirked its high responsibility. Congress ought not to have delegated to the Executive the power to shut the door of our country upon deserving people. If we do not want aliens in the United States, let the Congress have the courage to meet its responsibility and say so. If there be in America a majority which would shut and seal the door of immigration, let it be shut and sealed by the constitutional authority of our country. Let us not hark back to the old Federal spirit of 1798, and delegate to the President and to his subordinates of the executive branch the power of saying who shall come to the United States. Oh, that power may not be fairly exercised. It may not be wisely exercised. Under it thousands of persons who are eligible to come to this country as immigrants according to laws which Congress has passed are now actually being arbitrarily excluded and will be arbitrarily excluded permanently.

Discrimination is being practiced now in the viséing of passports. Applications for visés are not being considered by our consuls in the order in which they are made. They are not being granted or refused on the ground of their merit or lack of it. The Department of State is assuming to say who shall and who shall not come, not on the ground of eligibility under the immigration laws, not with relation to their character, but with relation to some arbitrary and fanciful standard which the department has adopted. I have only to-day received a letter from the Department of State in which Mr. Adey says that our consuls are discriminating, to the extent that they do not consider the applications of eligible immigrants in the order of their application, but that preference is being given to the wives and minor children and elderly parents of those who are now here. Perhaps if there must be a discrimination, that is a discrimination along proper lines; I make no question of that; but I do say that Congress is the body that ought to say who shall come to this country, and we ought to repeal the visé act.

The letter of the Department of State to which I have referred is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 19, 1921.

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 7, in which you asked to be informed whether American consular officers in the Baltic States and in central Europe are authorized to discriminate in viséing passports between applicants for visés who are parents of American citizens and other younger relatives, with a view to obtaining for such parents the transportation facilities available. You also asked whether such discrimination may be practiced when the applicant has a steamship ticket sent to him by an American relative.

In reply, I have the honor to inform you that in view of the great number of persons desiring to come to this country from abroad, American consular officers have been instructed to give preference, until the present situation has improved, to the most urgent and deserving cases, such as the wives and minor children or the elderly parents of persons already in the United States. The fact that a steamship ticket has been sent to the applicant by a relative in this country should have no bearing on the case. Those persons to whom visés are refused are being advised to renew their applications for visés at some later date when the restrictions now deemed necessary may perhaps be relaxed.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

ALVEY A. ADEE.

The operation of the visé law causes indescribable hardships. Thousands of immigrants are waiting at the doors of our central European consular offices to obtain visés. The process is slow and tedious. Weeks and months are consumed in the immigrant's effort to comply with the consul's requirements for proofs and other formalities. Immigrants wait many weary weeks without ever being able to get an interview with the consul. They do not know what is required of them, and hence

are unable to anticipate the consul's wishes. The work is done so slowly that it is estimated that it will take more than a year to act on the applications which have already been filed at some consular offices. There seems to be an intentional delay and shilly-shallying, seemingly intended to break down the patience of the applicant, to discourage him, and to drive him away from his purpose to come to the United States.

These difficulties and hardships, while primarily due to the law, are largely the fault of its administration. Persons desiring to come to the United States are entitled, as a matter of justice and right, to prompt action, prompt refusal, or grant of permission. They should be informed at once what they may expect. It is the responsibility of the President and of the majority party to provide an ample force of clerks in our consular offices to see to it that applications for visés are promptly acted on. They must stop the heartbreaking delays. American relatives of aliens wishing to come to the United States have the right to hold the majority party, which is in control both of Congress and the executive branch of Government, responsible for delays.

Perhaps the greatest hardship worked by the visé law is upon those being persecuted for political opinions or upon racial or religious grounds. These unfortunates, not being in harmony with their governments or the ruling classes, dare not appear at consular offices, dare not linger in public places, dare not wait until their visés may be granted. In some cases to appear in public would mean that they would be mobbed or imprisoned by the authorities. Yet if they slip away and come to the United States without a viséd passport they violate our laws and may be sent to the penitentiary.

One of the most shocking illustrations of the oppressive effect of the visé law is the case of the Irishman, O'Callaghan. He dared not ask for a British passport or to apply to our consul for visé. To do so meant prison, perhaps death. He slipped away and succeeded in reaching the United States. But he violated our visé law and committed a crime by coming to the United States. Because of the visé law our authorities must choose between putting O'Callaghan in prison and deporting him into the hands of his English enemies. The Secretary of Labor has decided to deport him if he is still in the country after the few days which have been given him to depart. It is thought he will go away voluntarily and secretly. But he may not do so. He may choose rather to be crucified by Ireland's enemies for its effect upon public opinion in America and the world. It will put our country in a sorry plight if as the result of the visé law we shall turn O'Callaghan over for execution by a firing squad.

Many citizens can not understand why O'Callaghan is being deported. They know that he is eligible to admission as an immigrant under our laws, and now that he is here, wonder why he is not regularly admitted as an immigrant. They do not know that it is because of the visé law. It will give the American people a shocking but clear idea of the forces of reaction now at work and the oppression inherent in the visé law, a war law now made permanent for purposes of peace, if as the result of it O'Callaghan should be deported and executed.

I again appeal to the majority in control of this House. The last Congress was elected with the war at high tide. The present Congress is an after-the-war Congress—a peace Congress—elected by constituencies ardently desiring peace and normal conditions. To obtain their seats, Republican Members generally pledged their faith to repeal the war laws and to restore peace conditions. The last Congress reenacted the visé law. I call upon this Congress to repeal it. I call upon the Republican majority to redeem their solemn campaign pledge by repealing this law. I place upon our Republican friends the responsibility for such repeal. I have to-day introduced a resolution providing for such repeal. If you fail to repeal the visé act you will take upon your shoulders the responsibility for maintaining the conditions which I have pointed out.

My resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution repealing the passport control act of March 2, 1921.
Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That so much of the act of March 2, 1921, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922," as follows, "That the provisions of the act approved May 22, 1918, shall, in so far as they relate to requiring passports and visés from aliens seeking to come to the United States, continue in force and effect until otherwise provided by law," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Mr. RAKER. I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PARRISH].

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my only regret in supporting this bill is that it is not sufficiently rigid to protect fully the rights of the American people. When I study the figures showing the number of immi-

grants who have actually come into this country since the signing of the armistice in 1918, and observe in that connection the rapid increase per month of the number of immigrants, I am more and more impressed with the necessity for the most stringent immigration laws.

To illustrate, during the last half of the calendar year 1919, 124,952 immigrants were admitted, or an average of 20,825 per month; in the first half of the calendar year 1920, this number was increased to 267,118, or an average of 54,519 per month, and in the last half of the calendar year 1920, 548,511 more immigrants were admitted to this country, or an average of 91,418 per month. It has been conservatively estimated that 350,000 have come into this country since this bill was passed in December of last year.

These figures show a tremendous increase in the number of immigrants who are now coming into this country, and this is true, notwithstanding the fact that we are still technically at war with Germany and Austria, and no immigrants from those countries have been admitted since 1914, and none from Russia since 1917. If peace is declared, and the rate of increase of the past six months is kept up, it is not at all unreasonable to expect that the number of immigrants coming to this country in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, will exceed 2,000,000 persons.

We have heard much about emergency of late, but in my judgment this is one of the greatest emergencies that has ever confronted the representatives of the people of the United States. I, for one, believe most earnestly that this is the time to awake and protect the American people against the ceaseless tide of immigrants flowing into this country.

A study of the character of these immigrants discloses that many of them are restless, adventurous, and poverty stricken. Some of them have criminal habits and dispositions, and others are afflicted with the most terrible diseases known to the Old World, and to turn them loose into this country under the lax rules and regulations now in force is but to invite crime, dissension, disorder, and suffering.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARRISH. I am sorry I can not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. PARRISH. We should stop immigration entirely until such a time as we can amend our immigration laws and so write them that hereafter no one shall be admitted except he be in full sympathy with our Constitution and laws, willing to declare himself obedient to our flag, and willing to release himself from any obligations he may owe to the flag of the country from which he came.

It is time that we act now, because within a few short years the damage will have been done. The endless tide of immigration will have filled our country with a foreign and unsympathetic element. Those who are out of sympathy with our Constitution and the spirit of our Government will be here in large numbers, and the true spirit of Americanism left us by our fathers will gradually become poisoned by this uncertain element.

The time once was when we welcomed to our shores the oppressed and downtrodden people from all the world, but they came to us because of oppression at home and with the sincere purpose of making true and loyal American citizens, and in truth and in fact they did adapt themselves to our ways of thinking and contributed in a substantial sense to the progress and development that our civilization has made. But that time has passed now; new and strange conditions have arisen in the countries over there; new and strange doctrines are being taught. The Governments of the Orient are being overturned and destroyed, and anarchy and bolshevism are threatening the very foundation of many of them, and no one can foretell what the future will bring to many of those countries of the Old World now struggling with these problems.

Our country is a self-sustaining country. It has taught the principles of real democracy to all the nations of the earth; its flag has been the synonym of progress, prosperity, and the preservation of the rights of the individual, and there can be nothing so dangerous as for us to allow the undesirable foreign element to poison our civilization and thereby threaten the safety of the institutions that our forefathers have established for us.

Now is the time to throw about this country the most stringent immigration laws and keep from our shores forever those who are not in sympathy with the American ideas. It is the time now for us to act and act quickly, because every month's delay increases the difficulty in which we find ourselves and renders the problems of government more difficult of solution. We must protect ourselves from the poisonous influences that are threatening the very foundation of the Gov-

ernments of Europe; we must see to it that those who come here are loyal and true to our Nation and impress upon them that it means something to have the privileges of American citizenship. We must hold this country true to the American thought and the American ideals.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Will the gentleman yield to me one minute of his time to allow me to correct a statement in the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PARRISH]?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman one minute.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PARRISH] has stated that the indications are that 2,000,000 or possibly more people will enter the United States in the coming year. The estimated steamship facilities for bringing people from all over the world for a year are 809,000. Now, why this hysteria? The gentleman also assumes that all of these people over there are antagonistic to American ideals and interests. Has the gentleman ever come in contact with a lot of these immigrants and does he really know that they are of that type? I come from The Bronx, where there are a great many of these so-called foreigners, and I have an intimate knowledge of their political opinions and ideals, and I can say to the gentleman from Texas that if he had even a speaking acquaintance with them he would quickly learn that they breathe higher and purer ideals than he had any previous knowledge of. I invite the gentleman from Texas to come to The Bronx and find out for himself what splendid American citizens they make. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, while we are discussing this question of immigration I think it is well to determine what we are going to do with a lot of the folks who are already here. A delegation is to-day canvassing this Congress in behalf of what is called amnesty for political offenders. They are placing in the front rank of the heroes who should be released one Eugene V. Debs, who is confined in the Federal prison at Atlanta. I want to speak a few minutes about that proposition, which I consider more dangerous than the flooding of this country with a lot of people who want to work for a living and who are starving where they are.

What did Mr. Debs do when the boys who have been spoken of here were at the front, and why is he in prison in Atlanta, and why this propaganda around here to get him out, which is being circulated in our offices to-day? When our boys were facing the crisis of the war, and when men from your districts and mine were going down by the thousands every day, Mr. Debs was out in Ohio preaching to the workmen, asking them to cut off the supplies for our boys and to break up the instrumentalities of this country with which to prosecute the war. He said to them, "Do not work on anything that will assist the boys at the front." He was in the same position as the fellow who comes along and finds a fire set by some incendiary and cuts the hose of the fire company that is the only connection with the water plug, and thereby paralyzes the power of the fire department that is endeavoring to save the property by putting out the conflagration.

And yet but a few weeks ago it was intimated that he was to be pardoned. He was accorded a remarkable privilege of divesting himself of his prison garb and going to Washington to present his case to the Attorney General in person, going back unguarded, an unprecedented thing it was, as the Attorney General admitted, because when asked if there was any such precedent he said there is one now, because we made it. I note that the Attorney General at Columbus two or three nights ago made a speech in which he said we propose to teach these people who are unpatriotic "that they must either love this country or leave it." [Applause.] I rise to ask if that was the intention of the Attorney General when he had them turn Debs out and let him travel 700 miles without a guard—was that an attempt to induce him to love his country or leave it—was he expected to jump the game or fall in love with this country? [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, you can say what you please, but that proceeding foreshadowed the pardon of Debs, and he has all the infamy that was wrought in that line while the war was going on. We had a great deal of fervid eloquence over Grover Cleveland Bergdoll the other day, and passed a resolution to spend \$10,000 investigating his case. Grover Cleveland Bergdoll was a big baby with more money than brains, who was made the dupe of Debs and his crowd by advice that they must not obey the draft law, and by standing out and evading the draft law he became a criminal. And yet we talk about pardoning Debs and proposing to give him perhaps a victory medal and special consideration and then spend \$10,000 to get the dupe of Debs back

here from Germany and turn him loose under an amnesty proposition.

I regret that the Attorney General has made the statement that he has established a precedent, one that he would not give to a man from my district who happened to make a little moonshine liquor and put down at Atlanta—I say they have established a precedent that will rise up to curse them in the future, because I know men who are in that position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman give me one minute more?

Mr. RAKER. Under the circumstances I will give the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. STEVENSON. I know a rather prominent citizen—

Mr. HERRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. HERRICK. The gentleman will recognize that Mr. Debs was man enough to go back to prison.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; and I can bring plenty of moonshiners that will do the same thing, and who would bring you something good if you would let them come up here. If they will accord that privilege to some men I know in the mountains of the South who have not considered that there was any harm in making a little liquor and who have been sent to Atlanta, who have boys who went over the seas and stood at the front of the line and helped to break the Hindenburg line—if you will give them the privilege which you gave Debs, they will come up here and go back, and if the Attorney General will allow them to sit down on one side of the table and he on the other, perhaps if they bring along a little something of their manufacture they might get pardon when the time comes. [Laughter.] I say give it to us all alike. [Applause.] I am opposed to the moonshiner and his product, but he is entitled to as much consideration as Debs, and I regret that the Debs precedent has been made by this administration.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOX].

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the question whether or not the United States will protect itself by the restriction of immigration is not a new one. It does not represent a temporary spirit of hysteria. It represents a feeling in the heart of the American people which first manifested itself actively some 70 or 80 years ago, and which has grown in volume and intensity up to now. The movement has come from the people. The demand for restriction was first heard and acted on by the State governments—Massachusetts, New York, and California first undertook to deal with it. Their power to do that was successfully denied in the Supreme Court of the United States. Then by petition, by the voice of their representatives elected and sent here, pledged thereto, they began to urge their fears and apprehensions and their demand for the enactment of restrictive laws. They have found that it is easier to get action in their States than here, and easier to get legislation in this body, which is closer to them, than it is from the one a little further up. They found that if they could get through this body and the Senate it was still harder to get by the White House. There have been five or six of these measures which have run the gantlet, moving from the people through this House and through the other body, which finally died by action of the President.

In 1879 President Hayes vetoed the first Chinese exclusion act. In 1882 President Arthur vetoed an act suspending Chinese immigration for a period of 20 years. President Cleveland vetoed an immigration act excluding illiterates. President Taft vetoed an immigration bill in 1913 containing a restriction against the admission of illiterates. In 1917 President Wilson vetoed an act excluding illiterates, but Congress passed it over his veto.

A bill similar to this one went to the White House at the end of the last session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and died for want of approval by President Wilson. So much for the statement that this bill represents merely a spurt of hysteria.

It is said by gentlemen opposing this and all restrictive legislation that our laws are not being properly administered and enforced because our appropriations are not sufficient. The organization for the enforcement of our immigration laws is insufficient. It is not properly sustained by Congress. I agree with the gentleman from New York on that point, and have supported his action in this House with a view of helping to remedy that situation. There are two courses presented—two horns of a dilemma. If we can not get the force needed to inspect and otherwise handle the present volume of immigration, we can reduce the immigration and protect our ports and borders with the force that we have. If we are going to handle

business on the present scale, we should increase the appropriation and enlarge the force, because the laws are not properly enforced. They are not in New York. I venture the assertion that they are not in Boston. They are not on the Canadian border. Neither are they on the Mexican border. The present system is largely a farce. I wish the country knew the extent to which this is true and realized how serious may be the consequences. I wish Congress and the executive department knew and fully appreciated both.

There are two ways to meet the situation. One is to reduce the volume of immigration and another is to greatly increase the machinery by which it is to be handled. Congress for the present appears to have decided not to increase the force. Then we must pursue the other course and reduce the number coming, thus making it easier to handle and giving the country the protection it demands and needs.

I do not look with favor on all of the provisions of this bill; it is not such a bill that I would like to help enact. I believe many of my colleagues on this committee feel that way. I especially reserve my position as to many of its provisions. I do not want to commit myself to the percentage plan. There are many things in it to which I do not commit myself permanently, but as a member of the committee and of this House I have studied the situation. I have reviewed and observed the efforts of the country to get legislation of this kind, and have come to the deliberate conclusion that it is this or nothing. It is proposed as an emergency measure. As such I support it. I can not get all that I want, but this promises a part of it. Though much more is needed and though I object to some of its provisions, I shall support it. Not because it is all it should be, but because it is my duty to help protect the country as far as I can, and because I believe this will give us some measure of protection, do I join with the chairman of this committee and the Members of this House in its enactment. I sincerely hope that we will promptly pass the bill; that the other body will pass it and that it will receive Executive approval. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, no Member can discuss a question of this importance in five minutes, but I am sure that to the 121 new Members of this House it must appear remarkable that members of a committee, after admitting that a great majority of this body is heartily in favor of restricting immigration to properly protect the interests of the American citizens, yet have to apologize for the emasculated bill which they bring before us to vote upon. Why is it that the distinguished chairman of the committee, who is heartily in favor of an adequate and proper bill, and who is one of the ablest men in this House, who thoroughly understands the question and thoroughly understands the need of this legislation, who has given much of his time to investigating this question, can not get the kind of bill out of his committee that he wants?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman has been here long enough to know the difficulty of reaching actual legislation in conference.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman knows that it took 12 years to get water-power legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; but if a majority of the Members here are in favor of a proposition, then bring it in here and let us vote upon it, and let us pass the kind of measure that we want to pass. Of course, always somebody objects to a measure of this kind. There are divergent interests. I was surprised to hear the distinguished orator from the great metropolis of the Nation the other day state that with the 6,000,000 people in New York City who are forced to get their living in that great city, the only reason that kept bread lines out right now is that it is not wintertime.

And after hearing the other distinguished gentleman from New York, who forms a minority of one party in this House [Mr. LONDON], tell what he thinks of suffering conditions in New York, I was more surprised when I called attention to that fact in my question to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] as to whether he had more sympathy and more interest in the horde of people in foreign Europe who wanted to come to this country than he had in the hundreds of thousands of American citizens who were out of jobs to find that he was unable to answer the question. I wanted to know how he stood on that question, but he could not answer it, and then endeavored to resort to impertinent personalities. However, he

intimated that there is no suffering in New York, because he said that the few who were out of jobs had plenty of money, that they had made plenty of money during the war and that they were going to theaters and still having a good time. Is that the real situation that now confronts thousands of men who are out of employment in New York? I have no patience and no sympathy with men out of employment who are out of it because they refuse to work a good honest day's work for a good honest day's pay. I have no sympathy with the thousands of citizens who say, "We will work if you will let us work 42 hours a week and pay us war prices, but we will not work 48 hours a week and we will not work for reasonable prices." I have no patience with that sort, and much of the unemployment in this country now is due to that situation; but I want to say this: That regardless of those facts there are 3,000,000 people now out of employment in the United States, many of whom were loyal soldiers who fought for our flag in France, and as long as that condition exists I am going to vote for any measure that will keep the foreign population from pouring into this country and further competing with them. I want time for our country to get its breath; I want time for readjustment. The great reconstruction period is upon us now, and we are confronted with these conditions. I wish this bill were ten times as stringent as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the American people are in favor of this legislation, at least 95 per cent of them. The American Congress, acting two years ago, demonstrated that fact by their Representatives on the floor of this House and in the Senate, for economic and American reasons. Gentlemen who have opposed this bill before and who are opposed to it to-day are constitutionally opposed to all legislation that will restrict immigration. They cite the special cases of hardship which would apply to any condition or circumstance, and hold them up as arguments that there should be no legislation so far as restricting immigration at the present time is concerned. We must look the condition squarely in the face. We find the reason presented by the committee in its report in November, 1920, justified by the facts, and again justified by the present conditions of the country, which are more urgent and important now than they were at that time. The conditions are becoming worse in respect to those who desire to come to this country than they were even a year ago. It behooves the American Congress to heed the voice of the American people, who know what they want, who have been putting up for the support of this Government, and who believe that those who are here should look to their own homes rather than to their neighbor's back door. It is a duty that the people owe to this country to protect their own, to see to it that the principles of this Government are maintained and that the fountain cause of the unstable condition, the wandering thoughts that have been generated for the last five years, are not further inoculated into the populace of this country.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman think that the wives and children of 98 per cent of those who are here will endanger our institutions?

Mr. RAKER. I believe with those who are already here that it has been demonstrated during the last three years that America is in more danger from within than she is from without and that we should not admit any more of these people who have the same idea, who have the same determination to destroy this country at the present time, until we assimilate those who are here and until we provide for those who are trying to tear down our own Government and make them realize that they are in America and that if they want to stay here they must abide by our laws and our principles.

Now, to illustrate the conditions abroad to show why this legislation ought to be enacted: In addition to what has been stated in the report we had a letter from the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, which comes from the consular agent, which we must recognize as stating the facts, because there can be no possible reason for a misstatement of those facts. I want to read that part of it which generally applies not only to the country from which they come but all over that devastated country, and you will find it reads as follows:

A second predominant feature in the whole movement of these emigrants of all classes is their reason for proceeding to the United States. A pitifully small percentage is moving with a fixed purpose. Hundreds, both Jewish and Christian, or those of no religious profession, have been asked why they wish to go to America. The answer almost invariably is, "Please, mister, we have rich relatives there. We can find an easier life." These are not the Europeans of a sturdier day, who in

family conference sternly resolved on the great adventure and set forth on unknown wastes to the new America across the seas. These are not those who hewed the forests, founded the towns, fought the savages, breasted the storms of wilderness, conquered the wastes, and built America. These are beaten folk, spirits broken, in effect driven from their European habitat into the west. They have no desire to form and build. They will exist on what has been prepared for them by a better people. They are in search of an easier life.

And on in other parts it is given that they are full of bolshevism.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman tell the House—

Mr. RAKER. Not for the present.

Mr. SABATH. Who makes this statement he has read from?

Mr. RAKER. This is a statement coming from the Secretary of State—

Mr. SABATH. I mean who wrote it?

Mr. RAKER. Who was once governor of the State of New York and at one time a great Associate Justice of the greatest court in the world; again, a candidate for President of the United States, and now the premier of the present President of the United States and of this country.

When refugees from war-stricken Europe are mentioned, there naturally arises in our minds the thought, "Is it right to prevent any of these people from coming here?" Is it not un-American, contrary to our traditional policy of providing "A refuge for the oppressed"? Sentiment can never solve great national problems. The indiscriminate kindness which we may seem to be able to show to the coming millions of European and Asiatic immigrants can in no conceivable way counterbalance the harm that these people may do to our race, especially if large numbers of them are mentally and physically unfit.

It appears from the reports which have been presented to the Committee on Immigration and a part of them which have been submitted to the House that—

Indiscriminate hospitality to immigrants is a supremely short-sighted, selfish, ungenerous, un-American policy. It may give some of us for the moment a comfortable feeling that we are providing a "refuge for the oppressed." But that is as now a state of mind as that which indiscriminately gives alms to any person on the street who asks for money. Such "charity" may truly produce a warm feeling of personal generosity in the giver himself. But alms giving of this sort does more harm than good. It is likely to pauperize him who receives, and it inevitably increases the burden of pauperism which future generations will have to bear. We have no right to saddle any additional burdens upon the already overburdened coming generations of Americans. It is in the highest degree un-American for us to permit any such influx of alien immigrants as will make the process of assimilation and amalgamation of our foreign population any more difficult than it already is. The situation is discouraging enough already.

Now, it seems to me that that sentiment answers the question that we have a haven for the oppressed and that we should open our doors entirely. We intend to give them every opportunity, but until we are able to assimilate, until we are able to digest, until we are able to provide for those who are already here, we ought not to throw the doors open to those who desire to come in—not a million, but all reports and all indications are that they want to come in by the millions. The last report seems to indicate that there are already those who desire to come in in the number of about 15,000,000 from these war-stricken territories of the Old World. We have some 10,000,000 already here, many of them who do not understand or receive the idea of our form of government. The purpose is to take a rest. The purpose is to allow ourselves and this country to digest that which we already have, and then, after the year and two months have passed, or if conditions change, we can in the meantime pass an immigration law that will be more selective than it is to-day, and if this law shall work any hardship at that time by its own operation it will end, or if it works beneficially at that time it can be extended until such time that conditions change so that there will be no danger of the comingling of too many voices, too many languages, and too many peoples who have never thought of the purposes and principles of this country. So we brought in a report and a bill here, not a bill that originally passed the House, but a bill that was placed upon the House bill as an amendment by the Senate, and in conference during the last six or seven days of the Sixty-sixth Congress the committee of the House, not being in favor of the percentage plan but knowing the importance of legislation of some kind that would restrict, adopted with several amendments the Senate amendment, and the conference report was then submitted to the two Houses and was passed by both Houses by a very large vote.

It seemed to many of us we ought to come back to restriction at the present time, admitting only the husband or the wife or the child, unmarried, male or female, under 16 years of age, then let it work for two years, and we would have had some better results, excepting those excepted classes which are provided for in this bill and practically all others. The only amendment that has been placed on this different from that which passed the House is in fact relating to soldiers, and while it is in here it is not necessary because the law authorizes them to come, as they are American citizens, by declaring their intentions, or they may be naturalized abroad

and come here, so the only thing is that it relates to those who are fleeing from religious persecution, and the testimony before the committee, not only on this bill but for the last three years, demonstrated practically beyond a doubt that so far as religious persecution is concerned there is to-day none in the Old World at this time, as was clearly stated by my distinguished friend and colleague on the committee [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I do.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The regular immigration law exempts those who are persecuted for religious reasons?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Then why should this emergency act exclude them from the computation of 3 per cent? Why should it not be included in the 3 per cent rather than excepted?

Mr. RAKER. Well, it really makes no difference, as in the last few years only about 14 have tried to come to the United States who claimed that they were fleeing from religious persecution. So we have excluded them from the 3 per cent. Why, my dear sir, if we had had the votes—we lacked a few in the committee—we would have adopted the old bill striking out the blood relatives and permitting only the husband or the wife to send for each other, as the case might be, and bringing in the minor children under 16 years of age.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I regret that there should be any dispute concerning these reports which are entered in this report of the committee as Appendix A, transmitted to me for the use of the committee, and later for the use of the House.

I suspect that if this committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, had taken advantage of the very broad powers given to it in the last Congress, to sit where it pleased and make inquiries where it pleased, we might have gone into the very heart of central Europe to investigate personally and make report to Congress, we could not have done so in written or spoken words which would have pleased all the people. Facts are facts. Exactly as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHANDLER] who preceded me has said, what can you expect to exist in central Europe after such a war? It is with no exultation that I as chairman bring forth a bill from our committee in an effort to suspend or restrict or check immigration. I do so with sorrow. I sympathize with broken people everywhere. Our majority of that committee brings the bill forth because it is thought to be a necessity to cover an emergency.

The gentleman who preceded me in his very able speech spoke of Texas and its area. I hold in my hand a letter, only one of many of its kind which pour into our committee room daily. This happens to be from Cleveland, Ohio, which has had its influx of aliens who are now out of work, and where there are more foreign-language newspapers than there are English papers. This writer contends that the immigration question is the most vital problem before the American people to-day. He says in part:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, April 17, 1921.

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,

Representative from Washington, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have always contended that the immigration question is one of the most vital, if not the most vital, problem facing the American people to-day. It is a problem that strikes at the very roots of our social, economic, and political welfare; but the American public, with characteristic laxity, have almost ignored the question entirely; and, what is more important, the voice of the American people as represented in the Nation's English-language periodicals and publications has almost ignored the question, while the foreign-language press and foreign racial societies have been feverishly engaged in a campaign of spreading broadcast propaganda in favor of a free and open immigration policy, unrestricted in any manner, shape, or form. And, of course, they are not pursuing this course entirely out of patriotism and devotion to America. There are many ulterior motives behind their campaign, and most of them are personal and mercenary. What has been the result of this campaign? It has succeeded in partly clouding the issue and in befuddling the minds of the few Americans who really gave some serious thought to this question. The foreign-language press is always at it for the foreigner. They usually wind up with a strong condemnation and vilification of any American who has the temerity to advocate any form of restricted immigration. As far as the economic side of the question is concerned, they have carefully and tactfully ignored it entirely.

In my humble opinion, the immigration policy of this country should be based almost solely on the economic situation of the Nation. It is not so much a question of whether we should be the saviors of humanity and receive with open arms any and all of the world's surplus population as it is a question of whether we can take care of them or "assimilate" them after we receive them. By that I mean whether we can find places for them in our industries, in our already overcrowded cities, and in our scheme of national existence. With

approximately 4,000,000 workers unemployed, with a scarcity of homes in our cities, with our schools overcrowded, with many of our unemployed driven to crime and suicide by their desperate situation, etc., it seems to me that America has a man-sized job on her hands to look after her own people without also taking care of the surplus population of the rest of the world. It would seem to the unbiased observer that the present economic situation of the country is surely not a very strong argument in favor of unrestricted immigration.

I have read the opinion of one of our so-called foremost editorial writers of the country. He maintains that we could place 10,000,000 immigrants in the State of Texas alone and still have lots of breathing space left. This may be true. But what would those 10,000,000 souls do once they arrived there? How would they exist? Since many of them are unsuited for farming pursuits and since most of them absolutely detest and refuse to do farming, how would they get the food and clothing to live at all? They could starve in Texas just as easily as they could in Europe. "Charity begins at home," says the old proverb, and this saying is applicable to the present situation. America should first put her own house in order and take care of her own people before trying to take in the rest of the world. To give a helping hand is a fine, humane policy, but when that helping hand means to take in the strangers and have them "eat" you out of home, job, and country it is foolishness and not charity.

Yours, truly,

L. S. S.

What my correspondent says regarding English-language periodicals and publications is not true as to all, but it is a fact that many papers do gloss over the situation, because they are in the same position that some of us are in—they want to stand up for the United States, but they do not want to be placed in the attitude of opposing any alien peoples or offending any of the foreign born; but they should realize that the children of all of us will have this problem to face, and will find it still harder to meet and still harder to solve.

Mr. SABATH. By whom was that letter written?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is one of many letters received by our committee.

This bill is advocated as a temporary measure, my friends, because we have actual unemployment to the number of probably 4,000,000 people. We heard the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] the other day in a discussion of the tariff state something of the situation in his city.

This House the other day passed an antidumping clause of a tariff bill, antidumping for the products of the hands. This is an antidumping bill of another kind, for the antidumping of the hands themselves, and I contend that it needs passage by the House and Senate and the signature of the President. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. KINDRED, and Mr. ROSSDALE were given leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] has consumed all his time, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has 7 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has 28 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABATH. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON]. [Applause.]

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have no hope of presenting even an outline of this subject. The world is still crazy. The war is not over. After preaching for thousands of years the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and then engaging for five years in slaughter, it is but natural that we should be in an abnormal state. While the killing of men's bodies has stopped, the poisoning of minds has just begun. This bill is a continuation of the war upon humanity. It is an assertion of that exaggerated nationalism which never appeals to reason and which has for its main source the self-conceit of accumulated prejudice.

At whom are you striking in this bill? Why, at the very people whom a short while ago you announced you were going to emancipate. We sent 2,000,000 men abroad to make the world "safe for democracy," to liberate these very people. Now you shut the door to them. Yes. So far, we have made the world safe for hypocrisy and the United States incidentally unsafe for the Democratic Party, temporarily at least. [Laughter.] The supporters of the bill claim that the law will keep out radicals. The idea that by restricting immigration you will prevent the influx of radical thought is altogether untenable. You can not confine an idea behind prison bars. You can not exclude it by the most drastic legislation. The field of thought recognizes no barriers. The fact that there was almost no immigration during the war did not prevent us from importing every abominable idea from Europe. We brought over the idea of deportation of radicals from France, not from the France of Rousseau, Jaurès, and Victor Hugo but from the France of the Bourbons. We imported the idea

of the censorship of the press and the passport system from Russia, not from the Russia of Kropotkin and Tolstoy but from the Russia of Nicholas II. We have imported the idea of universal military service from Germany, not from the Germany of Heine, Boerne, and Freiligrath but from the Germany of the Kaiser.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. LONDON. Ideas can neither be shut in nor shut out. There is only one way of contending with an idea, and that is the old and safe American rule of free and untrammelled discussion. Every attempt to use any other method has always proven disastrous.

While purporting to be a temporary measure, just for a year or so, this bill is really intended to pave the way to permanent exclusion.

To prevent immigration means to cripple the United States. Our most developed industrial States are those which have had the largest immigration. Our most backward States industrially and in the point of literacy are those which have had no immigration to speak of.

The extraordinary and unprecedented growth of the United States is as much a cause as the effect of immigration.

Defenders of this bill thoughtlessly repeat the exploded theory that there have been two periods of immigration, the good period, which the chairman of the committee fixes up to the year 1900, and the bad period since. The strange thing about it is that at no time in history has any country made such rapid progress in industry, in science, and in the sphere of social legislation as this country has shown since 1900.

The new immigration is neither different nor worse, and besides that, identically the same arguments were used against the old immigration.

By this bill we, who have escaped the horrors of the war, will refuse a place of refuge to the victims of the war.

I repeat, this is an attempt at civilization. Progress is by no means a continuous or uninterrupted process. Many a civilization has been destroyed in the tortuous course of history and has been followed by hundreds or thousands of years of darkness. It is just possible that unless strong men who love liberty will everywhere assert themselves, the world will revert to a state of savagery. Just now we hear nothing but hatred, nothing but the ravings of the exaggerated I—"I am of the best stock, I do not want to be contaminated; I have produced the greatest literature; my intellect is the biggest; my heart is the noblest"—and this is repeated in every parliament, in every country, by every fool all over the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman one minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me take a little time to say that I think time will be offered to-morrow very liberally under the 5-minute rule for the serious discussion of some of these important questions.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman allow me, not to be taken out of his time, to say that Members have spoken to me, and I understood the gentleman from Washington to say that when we get through with general debate we will not take it up under the 5-minute rule to-day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No.

Mr. LONDON. The unemployment question has been referred to by gentlemen who preceded me in this discussion. Gentlemen, I tried in the Sixty-fourth and Sixty-fifth Congresses to present the problem of unemployment a half dozen times. Unemployment is incident to the present system of industry. One can not have competition in industry without having unemployment. Competition involves the constant shifting of jobs, the frequently occurring separation from employment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Have they not unemployment in Russia, and no competition?

Mr. LONDON. There is entirely too much misinformation about Russia, and I will say to those who think they have definite opinions about Russia that there is a proverb that is applicable to them. "Do not show to a fool an unfinished job." Russia has just begun her great revolution, and it is a new and unfinished job. Let us leave Russia alone for the moment. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think they have finished Russia.

Mr. LONDON. I hope not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. LONDON. It took the American people from 1783 to 1787—four years—to make a Constitution, and here are 140,000,000 people in Russia, with complicated problems to solve, and it may take them three, four, ten years or more to do so. Incidentally, I am also opposed to this bill because it will keep out political rebels. With the aid of the visé system we admit only those who are approved by the King of Rumania, the King of England, the Queen of Holland, and the rest of Europe's royalty. What strange times, indeed.

To come back to the subject of unemployment. In Europe they killed off 10,000,000 people. They disabled 20,000,000 people, and they should have very much employment, but they have not. Unemployment does not depend on the number of persons, on the number of men. Unemployment shows a state of chaos in industry, a lack of relation between the job and the job seeker, between the worker and his job. It is a case of maladjustment. The problem of unemployment should be taken up as a great industrial problem, for the problem is ever present. In the near future I hope to present the subject in all of its ramifications to this Congress.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. Is not the admission of the immigrant you are seeking a case of charity?

Mr. LONDON. Charity is a very broad term. I despise charity in its philanthropic sense, because if there were justice in the world there would be no necessity for charity.

Mr. MORGAN. If you have charity for the suffering humanity in this country, why should you increase it by the presence of such immigration?

Mr. LONDON. I insist that the prosperity and growth of the United States can not be separated from the question of immigration. When the United States was formed its flag had only 13 stars, and it is due to the immigrants and their offspring that 35 stars were added to the flag. Every American problem is a problem of humanity.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I have but one more gentleman to speak on my side. It seems to me that we ought to have a quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nineteen Members present, a quorum.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]. [Applause.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I doubt very seriously if the full significance of this measure is fully appreciated by the gentlemen who are supporting it. I think it is of more far-reaching importance than any bill that has been considered in Congress since the Civil War, if not since the organization of the country. Because it is no exaggeration to say that if enacted it is the deliberate renunciation and final abandonment of the policy which has fixed the position of this great Nation in the forefront of civilization, which has made it a bulwark of peace and a light of progress to the whole world. I do not know whether gentlemen here appreciate the fact that practically every great convulsion in history—all the movements of races that have produced the cataclysms in which ancient political systems have perished—have been caused by an imperative, inexorable necessity of every possessor of human hands to seek the field on which he can employ them to the utmost profit for himself. The hordes of barbarians who swept over the Roman provinces were not cruel men seeking blood; they were hungry men seeking through conquest pasture for their flocks and herds. That is equally true of the crowds that followed Genghis Khan and Tamerlane. One of the reasons why wise men and philosophers have held a condition of permanent peace in this world to be absolutely impossible was that same unpoised desire for better fields of labor, which could not be repressed, to gratify which men threw themselves freely against ramparts and frontiers and phalanxes, preferring to risk death in battle rather than submit passively to want or danger of want in places which could no longer afford them adequate support.

This country ever since its discovery has furnished the means by which the flux of the human race was given a peaceful and even a profitable vent. I wonder if gentlemen here realize that since this Government was established more Gauls and Goths, Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Huns and Vandals, Burgundians, and Lombards have entered this country than ever entered forcibly

the provinces of old Rome? But instead of meeting them with weapons in our hands at the frontier and resisting their entrance, we have welcomed them, placed implements of industry in their hands, and set them to work on our soil. And if ever a national policy was vindicated by successful results, the whole history of this country attests the splendor of the wisdom which opened our ports to all the children of men who were willing to live by cultivating the land. I think I may say without fear of contradiction that the experience of this country shows that nothing so valuable can enter our ports as a pair of human hands eager to cultivate our soil and by their labor contribute to the resources of our country. It has been that tide of laborers flowing through our ports which has made this land a smiling garden of plenty.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the force of what has been said here by several gentlemen who are supporting this bill, that the first, the main obligation of an American Member of Congress is to look out for the welfare of the American people. If the admission of immigrants to this country, however it might ease conditions abroad, could in the slightest degree imperil not merely the safety of our institutions, but the prospects of employment for our own laborers or of prosperity for the American people, I would be the first to advocate not lessening immigration, but preventing it. But because I believe the immigrant who cultivates our soil contributes to the welfare of the country as much, even more, than he derives from it, I am opposed to restricting a source of benefit so important to our country. What must be the effect, the economic effect, of admitting men from all over the world? Against everything that has been said concerning the admission of insane persons, persons who are depraved, persons who are diseased, persons against whom any objection can be made on the score of their capacity for citizenship, I have no objection to make. Precautions can not be too elaborate in that direction. Indeed, I doubt if any precaution could be added to those that have already been established, because you now provide that no man can come in who is diseased, who is depraved, whose political opinions even are in conflict with those principles, political and ethical, which underlie the stability of our Government. More than that, you require that he must be able to read a language, which is not a requirement imposed on American citizenship. And you require that he be a man of established good character. What more desirable person can come here? What more desirable addition to our citizenship can be made than a man who meets all these requirements? We can not suspect for a moment that these requirements will not be vigorously applied. Several gentlemen here have done me the honor to quote what I said a few days ago about the unemployment that is actual in New York and the graver unemployment that is impending in every great city of this country and of the world. How is that grave condition to be remedied? We are suffering from an unparalleled destruction of commodities in war, an annihilation of wealth more extensive than has ever been known in the history of nations. How in the name of all that is sensible can that dreadful waste be repaired except by production? Production, I think everybody will concede, is the method by which this waste of war can be repaired. But production can be effected only by labor. How can any man come into this country and live except by his labor?

Why, some gentlemen here spoke as though these immigrants were coming here for no other purpose than to blow up the Constitution, if they could get their hands on it. [Laughter.] Conceive for one moment the character of such a statement. That a man will come 5,000 or 6,000 miles, suffering the utmost hardships of a transatlantic voyage, parting with the last penny he owns in order to obtain passage, and all the time he is moved not by a desire to benefit himself but by a desire to blow up our Constitution! Now, think of that for a serious argument addressed to sensible men! Can there be a higher proof of devotion to our Constitution conceivable than that a man to come under its blessings will take all the risk, the discomforts of a long journey to a country of whose language he is ignorant, to whose customs he is a stranger, leaving his home and his fireside, the associations of all the generations that preceded him? One gentleman read a statement here as though it were an objection to that class of immigrants that they wanted an easier time. In the name of common sense, does anyone believe they came here for a harder time? How now is he to get the easier time? He is not likely to be received at the port where he lands with bouquets offered him by strangers, with presents from the bystanders to make his pathway easy. There is but one way he can keep himself from starving, and that is by labor. I think the record of immigration to this country shows that the immigrant takes to labor immediately on landing, if not from choice certainly from necessity. I think I may

say he takes to it from choice; otherwise, he would not have undertaken the journey. Now, labor leaders tell me that every laborer who comes here from a foreign country deprives a native laborer of employment. If that were true, I would be the last to countenance any measure that tolerated the admission of immigrants to this country. But the immigrant laborer, far from depriving the native laborer of employment, furnishes him with employment.

Apply your common sense to this problem and you will see at once there is no way by which any man can work without creating employment for others. Can a man mine coal and bring a ton to the surface of the earth without giving employment to other men in transporting it, and still others in applying it to the different industrial purposes it may serve in its consumption? Can a man sow a field of grain without giving employment to another man to reap the crop, and though he should be the sower and reaper himself must not other men transport the grain to the mills, and still other men convert that raw material into the finished product—the bread—essential to the support of human life? Again it must be remembered that no man can exercise skilled labor on the surface of the earth. Skilled labor can only be employed and exercised on some product of the earth. And that product must first be drawn from the earth by a cheaper labor or the skilled laborer can not draw the high wages that he enjoys in this country. Picture to yourself the daily work of a bricklayer. I believe he gets \$10 a day. Does anybody believe that he could earn that \$10 a day if there were not some cheaper laborer to carry the brick so that his skilled, muscular energies can be employed on that higher form of production? Suppose it were the case that he must carry his own brick. Does anybody believe he could then earn \$10 a day? There is no production in which human hands can be exercised that the field of employment does not widen for other hands and the volume of commodities available to support existence does not increase.

We are now at this moment turning around almost helplessly, wondering how production shall be increased. And we find this majority—it is not a party measure but it is still a majority of the House—I do not mean a political majority, but none the less a majority—actually arguing a measure to exclude the hands that are essential to production of commodities after another measure has been passed to exclude the product that is so urgently needed for the support of our crowded populations in great cities. My friends, this measure, if it passes, extinguishes the light of hope and progress to humanity throughout the world.

No man can estimate the degree to which conditions throughout the world have been improved, the degree to which men have been induced to bear patiently conditions unutterably hard in the hope of reaching this asylum, where by labor upon the soil they could transform these conditions of misery to a measure of comfort which they could never dream of attaining in their own lands.

We are told free admission of immigrants would make our country unsafe. There could be no contribution to the safety of our institutions, to the reinforcement of the foundations on which our Constitution stands, equal to this army of labor-seeking men eager to benefit their own conditions by improving and stimulating the growth of wealth in this country. Are you aware that the people who own property in this country are not over 10 per cent of the population? To what, then, must we trust the safety of that property? If we trusted defense of it to its possessors, it would be in serious danger; it would not be secure for 30 days. But while there are but 10 per cent of the population owning property, there are 80 or 90 per cent who hope to own property, and those who hope to own property and those who own property together make an overwhelming majority of the people of this country. It is that hope of acquiring property which has made this country the wonderful Nation it is, where a contented because hopeful population formulates the laws that make property secure by making justice universal. These thousands, these millions, if you will, who are hastening to this country now to perform the essential basic labor without which the higher forms of labor can not be performed at all are performing the part which the Helots of old performed in the old Spartan system. There the Helots gained admission to citizenship and liberty for themselves and their children by service on the battle field. These hosts of prospective laborers coming here are the modern Helots of American industry, seeking to gain admission for themselves and their children to our citizenship by service in the industrial field. Without them the progress of this country would suffer not merely arrest for a while or to some degree, but, in my judgment, a total collapse. Were it not for the immigrants, where could you obtain that basic labor without

which skilled labor can not be exercised? Where would it come from? No educated American will perform what is called the baser form of labor. And if all Americans are not educated, with the blessing of God they soon will be. For it is a fundamental necessity of our system that its rulers—that is to say, its citizens—must be educated to the degree where exercise of their sovereign powers will be governed by wisdom and judgment, which would be impossible without adequate instruction.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But is not there some point to the statement, so often made, that many immigrants come here to find opportunity and, failing to find it, charge mistreatment and are quick to listen to assaults on the Government?

Mr. COCKRAN. Any chance to labor is to him the greatest opportunity in the world. He never dreamed of any other. He does not come here with the hope that he will be chosen to administer the Government unless, indeed, he be among some of those who are admitted under your limitations to the effect that only the educated can enter. I opposed that idea of a literacy test bitterly in Congress, on the ground that what we wanted here were not linguists but laborers. We wanted men not with glib tongues, but with calloused hands. I would value the man with the calloused hands that show he is habituated to labor more than one who could display the utmost didactical ability in answering questions of United States examiners. We have plenty of speakers; we do not need any more to come along and help us rule. What we want is men who will cultivate the earth. The native American will supply all the political capacity that is necessary to run this Government. [Laughter and applause.] We need the foreign laborer to make our soil fruitful, to make it fruitful of the basic raw materials on which skilled labor is exercised, without which, I venture to say, the great city of New York would not to-day be half its size. There is not a building that has arisen in any great city which has not owed far more than half its growth to the common, unskilled labor that carried the brick and other materials to the skilled labor, and to the labor that carried the pail out of which the skilled labor drank the water that refreshed its parched lips. Without that great stream of unskilled labor which keeps our skilled labor in operation you will abolish—certainly restrict, but probably abolish—the prosperity of which we are so proud. Above all, in this crisis of the world's history, even if there were no such absolute necessity for recruiting the volume of our unskilled labor here, the dictates of humanity, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHANDLER] has well said, would urge us to give the victims of war an asylum from the conditions which we ourselves aided to produce. It should not be forgotten that men who are suffering to-day the terrible conditions prevailing in Europe are victims of a war which we carried to a successful conclusion.

We are hearing every day of appeals to aid those war victims by charity. No man ever ate the bread of charity without suffering demoralization of character. Our proper rôle is to let them gain their own bread by honorable employment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] yields to the gentleman six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields to his colleague from New York six minutes.

Mr. COCKRAN. I am very grateful indeed to the gentleman. Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. COCKRAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. BLANTON. What effect will these incoming hordes that the gentleman would like to see come in have upon the bread lines about which the gentleman spoke the other day so feelingly?

Mr. COCKRAN. They would help to dissipate these bread lines, help to give willing men work, so that they will not have to join the bread lines. I tried to make it clear and thought I had made it clear to most gentlemen. Let me repeat it to this gentleman of Texas [laughter], that no man can work without creating employment for others.

Mr. BLANTON. Surely with the 3,000,000 idle men now there are some hod carriers and some ditch diggers that want work.

Mr. COCKRAN. There are; but they are not employed because the whole machinery of production has been dislocated and disarranged, largely by the total suspension of immigration during the war and the restriction of production, which was its consequence. The more that come here and go out into the country and toil, the more commodities there will be for those who dwell in the cities. [Applause.] We can not exchange

commodities until we produce them. One thing that impressed me in listening to the debates on the emergency tariff bill is the strange belief entertained by some gentlemen here that commodities can be summoned from the bosom of the earth by legislation. [Laughter.] There seems to be a general idea among gentlemen on the other side that in some way or another miracles can be wrought by legislation. Although I do not think that any one of them would attempt to play the part of necromancer if he were alone, yet the moment they go into committee, especially into the Committee on Ways and Means, they seem to imagine that in their aggregate capacity they can perform miracles which not one of them can pretend to accomplish in his individual capacity. [Laughter.] And so, perhaps, it is natural that having undertaken to remedy the scarcity of commodities which now makes it difficult to support life by excluding the products of foreign hands, they should now proceed to exclude the hands themselves. But it is difficult to reconcile with hope or common sense. I want especially to thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], who so courteously extended my time, and to say this in conclusion: That so far as measures to restrict immigration to the really worthy are concerned, nobody would support them more warmly than I.

But do you not realize the high standard for admission already established by law; that already you have provided in effect that no one can come in here unless he is a soldier, a sailor, a potential statesman, a scholar, and a gentleman? [Laughter.] That was applied in his day to Sir Walter Raleigh, the knightliest figure of a great age. Under existing law the immigrant must be a scholar, because he must know how to read and write. He must be a sailor, for he must cross the ocean. He must be a soldier, for he is liable to the draft. He must be a statesman, for he will be given the vote, and he will be unable to use it unless he is at least a potential statesman; and he must be a gentleman, because good conduct is one of the qualifications that we exact. And while you provide that those who come in to till the soil must meet that standard of excellence, how can you apprehend any damage to come from their admission? The immigrant gives you the guaranty of love for our country by coming here. Surely the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] will not say for a moment that of the 10,000 that debark from vessels at our ports every week there is any considerable number who would want to blow up our Constitution, even if they could find out where it is located. [Laughter.] They do not come here to destroy the Government that they are eager to join. Do you not see what a contradiction there is between the actions of these men and the motives that you impute to them? They have to "go broke" to come here, to use a familiar colloquialism. They usually have to spend for passage not only what they themselves can raise, but all that their friends can spare in the hope that when the efficient worker gets settled on this soil he will be able to bring over his family to join him. And what could more conduce to the welfare of this country than admission of human beings who want to come here for the purpose of tilling the land in order to obtain the means by which their own condition of life can be improved, with that of their families, and thus secure a prosperity the like of which they had never hoped to attain on their own soil?

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] said they can not always obtain opportunity for well-paid labor. Well, the \$2 or \$3 a day that they can obtain for unskilled labor is four times what they could obtain under the most favored circumstances in their own country. What they can obtain here is affluence sufficient to satisfy their wildest dreams of avarice.

To us, I repeat, immigration yields the incalculable advantage of affording the means by which the skilled labor of the country can be kept employed. Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is true that the foreign laborer does displace the American laborer, but he displaces him by lifting him on his shoulders up to a higher plane of employment, where his wages are larger, his hours of labor shorter, and his conditions immeasurably improved. [Applause.]

For that reason, for the welfare of the American laborers, for the prosperity of our country, for the security of our Government, for the welfare of humanity, for the peace and progress of the whole world I believe this measure should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has five minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] two minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we have all been interested in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], who has given as much time and study to this subject, probably, as any other citizen of the United States, and who has appeared before all of the

Senate and House committees in recent years that have held hearings on the subject.

The gentleman's line of argument does not admit that an emergency exists. I think an emergency does exist. I do not charge that the average alien is coming here to assault this country, but I do charge that before the war when he came here he was taken advantage of in a lowered wage. I charge that often he belongs to alien associations which undertake to affect the affairs of this Government, although the associations are made up of those who can not themselves vote. I contend also that a very considerable amount of the organized labor troubles in this country, particularly among the common laborers, has been caused by the "boring-from-within" process, by the taking into the ranks of organized labor of aliens without a vote in the United States, who do vote in those organizations, which in turn influence affairs in the United States. [Applause.] Organized labor does not desire to be all alien, but if the aliens come too fast and organized labor makes members of them, all can see what will happen.

Mr. COCKRAN. If the gentleman will allow me, that is a serious matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is indeed a serious matter. Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman give the facts on which that statement is based, because it goes to the very root of the matter?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman mean as to whether aliens are members of organized labor associations?

Mr. COCKRAN. Oh, no; but that they are organized for the purpose of making trouble for the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We had a complete exposé of the organization in New York City of the Russian Workers' Union, with not a single naturalized American in it, and every member had taken the oath that he was an anarchist, a destructionist, and against all government.

Mr. COCKRAN. What is the proof of that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think that was amply proved.

Mr. COCKRAN. I never heard of it, and I have lived in New York for some time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Many members of the Russian Workers' Union were deported on the *Buford*. I can read the translations, or, at least what purported to be translations, of their constitution. I am able also to read the Third Internationale Manifesto, and I think those who pay dues and who are in that organization in the United States know what it means, and I am sure it means no good to the United States.

Mr. COCKRAN. Can the gentleman state as to the number of persons affected by that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not care whether it is 2,000 or 10,000 or 20,000.

Mr. COCKRAN. Does not the gentleman think the number is a matter of some importance?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do indeed. I do not think that one alien member should be permitted to remain here. I do not care whether the number is 1 or 100 or 1,000; all aliens who outrageously defame this Government of ours have no right to try to remain in the United States; and I notice that, as a rule, the people who stand up and defend them and protest sending them out of the country are usually the people who themselves want more and more aliens to come into the United States.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that the present immigration law excludes all such people as the gentleman has designated?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Certainly, but they are here.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Not now. My contention is that much of this immigration that has crowded itself upon us in the last 12 or 13 years has come here in the hope of a quick return, and too often not finding it, they are quick to charge that they have been deceived, and are quick to turn against this Government. And my friends, I am sorry to say it, but my belief is that if that is so in this great country of ours which has used up its natural resources so rapidly, we had better slow up production, slow the turning of the wheels, mine less coal, cut less trees, all to employ and to feed more and more people pouring in from other countries, only to complain that they toiled to enrich the few. Those who are coming in now, I am certain, are not like the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] and others who made the adventure years ago. Those who come now are the broken down. They do not have their own initiative and are unable to make

a start for themselves. They are assisted and promoted all along the line from one war-stricken country to another war-stricken country, and as far as I am able to learn, in every country the cry is "move on," and every country, even France, helps to send them to this country. All assist and aid and urge them on. They shove them on to the United States, and that is why we offer this bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has two minutes remaining.

Mr. SABATH. I hope that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] who has preceded me will in the near future furnish to the House evidence that he may have against these aliens whom he alleges are conspiring against our Government. I will say to him and to the House that, notwithstanding the four trying years, he nor any other man can point out where any of these men have been convicted of any of the crimes or offenses of which he complains and charges them with. He states that the present immigration is not made of the same stuff as the immigration that we have been receiving in the past. The charges he makes against the present immigration were made against the immigrants who came here 100 years ago, 80 years ago, 60 years ago, 40 years ago, and 10 years ago. Time, however, has shown that the charges were unfounded against the people of that time, and history will prove that the charges that are being made against the present immigration are again unfounded, unjustifiable, and unfair. The truth is they have and are making good and proving their worth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired, all time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act—

The term "United States" means the United States and any waters, territory, or other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof except the Isthmian Canal Zone and the Philippine Islands; but if any alien leaves the Canal Zone or any insular possession of the United States and attempts to enter any other place under the jurisdiction of the United States nothing contained in this act shall be construed as permitting him to enter under any other conditions than those applicable to all aliens.

The word "alien" includes any person not a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, but this definition shall not be held to include Indians of the United States not taxed nor citizens of the islands under the jurisdiction of the United States.

The term "immigration act" means the act of February 5, 1917, entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States"; and the term "immigration laws" includes such act and all laws, conventions, and treaties of the United States relating to the immigration, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens.

During the reading of the first section the following occurred:

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman withhold that for the present until the Clerk finishes the reading of the section? This bill will be considered by section and not by paragraph.

Mr. RAKER. That is the ruling of the Chair, is it, that it is to be considered by sections?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules of the House a bill of this character is considered by sections and not by paragraphs. The Clerk completed the reading of the section.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STAFFORD reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4075) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on to-morrow, immediately after the approval of the Journal, I may have leave to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes immediately after the reading of the Journal to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, I think it would hardly be fair to the committee having this bill before the House to give unanimous consent to a speech on another subject after the House has proceeded to the consideration of a bill under the five-minute rule. I hope the gentleman can make his speech later.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 25 minutes day after to-morrow after the approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, we granted the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] an opportunity to address the House on yesterday when we had no other business before the House. In the last Congress I announced that, meeting what I believed was the view of the majority of Members, I would not, except for very compelling reasons, grant unanimous consent for speeches at specified times when there might be other business before the House. I have not made that statement in this Congress, and in view of the fact that the gentleman from Ohio did have an opportunity to address the House at a time fixed in advance I think perhaps I would not be justified in objecting now. But I desire to repeat what I said in the last Congress touching this matter of the announcement of speeches, that except in very unusual cases I do not think the request should be granted. I think that is the view of the majority of gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Mr. POU. I think this is the first time in 20 years that I have preferred such a request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If we should find that amendments offered to this bill should cause it to be discussed all day to-morrow and the vote should come on the next morning—

Mr. POU. I would not object. Any act of mine that will promote the passage of this bill I will gladly perform, and I would not throw any obstacle in its way.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE BERGDOLL COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as the committee on the Bergdoll investigation Mr. PETERS, Mr. McARTHUR, Mr. LUBRING, Mr. FLOOD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BANKHEAD, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for three days, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 21, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

40. A letter from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting report on combed cotton yarns in response to House resolution 451, Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

41. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of proposed legislation for the relief of the Kailan mining administration of Tientsin, China; to the Committee on Claims.

42. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Creeden & Avery (Ltd.); to the Committee on Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2739) granting a pension to Sarah J. Thompson, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 4569) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4570) to repeal section 500 of the revenue act of 1917 as amended by the act of February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4571) authorizing the Winnebago Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin and Nebraska to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4572) to authorize the Secretary of War to lease United States nitrate plant No. 2, at Muscle Shoals, Ala., with its appurtenances and dam in the Tennessee River; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 4573) to establish a fish-cultural station at some point in the State of Indiana on Lake

Michigan; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4574) to prohibit the intermarriage of persons of the white and Negro races within the District of Columbia, to declare such contracts of marriage null and void, to prescribe punishment for violation and attempt to violate its provisions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 4575) authorizing the payment of stationary engineers and others for service performed on Sundays and legal holidays; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 4576) to provide legal-tender money without interest for public improvements, market roads, building homes for its citizens, needs, employment of discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, unemployed, and other citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONTTOYA: A bill (H. R. 4577) to authorize the addition of certain lands in the State of New Mexico to a national forest in said State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 4578) to provide for the protection of the monetary gold reserve by the maintenance of the normal gold production of the United States to satisfy the requirements of the arts and trades, by imposing an excise upon all gold used for other than monetary purposes, and the payment of a premium to the producers of newly mined gold, and providing penalties for the violation thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4579) to create a national department of highways and a national highway commission therein, to promote and organize a national system of highways, to increase the economy and efficiency of transportation, to assist industry and commerce, to improve the facilities for postal service, and to provide additional means for national defense; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4580) to prohibit the coming of Asiatic laborers into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4581) to amend an act entitled "An act to parole United States prisoners, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended by an act approved January 23, 1913, and for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4582) to amend an act entitled "An act to parole United States prisoners, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended by an act approved January 23, 1913; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4583) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 4584) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Burley, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 4585) to establish a new judicial circuit of the United States with a circuit court of appeals, hereafter to be called the tenth circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 4586) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901," and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOCHT (by request): A bill (H. R. 4587) to regulate pawnbrokers and their business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4588) to provide pensions for all soldiers and marines of the War with Spain, the War with Mexico, and the war with Germany, who now receive pensions, at a minimum rate of \$50 per month; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4589) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 4590) for the appropriation of additional funds for the erection and completion of a Federal building at Franklin, N. H.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 4591) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post office at Canton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 4592) to prohibit the payment of gratuities to the masters of vessels or other persons for the purpose of inducing or securing contracts for repairing

vessels or furnishing vessels with supplies or other necessities; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 4593) for the purchase of a post-office site at Lawrenceburg, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4594) for the purchase of a post-office site at Dickson, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROOKS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4595) authorizing and empowering the President to invite all nations to send delegates to a convention to provide for disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 4596) to provide for the disposal of certain waste and drainage water from the Rio Grande project, New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4597) to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4598) to provide for the exchange of Government lands for privately owned lands in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4599) to amend an act entitled "An act to give indemnity for damages caused by American forces abroad," approved April 18, 1918; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4600) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish free transportation and subsistence from Europe to the United States for certain destitute discharged soldiers and their wives and children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 4601) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 4602) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer certain material, machinery, and equipment to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARK of Georgia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Albany, Ga., tents and cots for use of Confederate veterans in their State convention May 11 and 12, 1921; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) to reerect the statue of Abraham Lincoln upon its original site; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 63) repealing the passport control act of March 2, 1921; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIDDICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 64) to appropriate out of the funds of the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to bring test suits in the United States court, district of Montana, to determine the right of the Government to issue patents in fee to members of the Blackfeet Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 63) directing the Secretary of War to furnish to the House certain information; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: Resolution (H. Res. 64) to provide for the appointment of a clerk to the Committee on Railways and Canals; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LAMPERT: Memorial of Wisconsin Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to construct, erect, build, and maintain a bridge across the Mississippi River between the city of Prairie du Chien in the State of Wisconsin and the cities of McGregor and Marquette (North McGregor) in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Wisconsin Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to refrain from placing a duty on lumber imported from the Dominion of Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PARRISH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, in connection with return of so-called cotton tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, asking for full pension for emergency Army officers under same conditions as they are granted to members of the Regular Establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 4603) for the relief of F. H. Abbott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 4604) granting an increase of pension to William J. Webb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4605) granting a pension to James M. Howard, alias William C. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 4606) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Luckey, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 4607) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gainesville, State of Georgia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4608) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Homer, State of Georgia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4609) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dahlonaga, State of Georgia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4610) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jefferson, State of Georgia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4611) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Blue Ridge, State of Georgia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4612) granting a pension to Nancy Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4613) granting a pension to Mary Lee Love; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4614) granting a pension to Frank R. Wall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 4615) granting a pension to Lydia E. Krugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 4616) granting an increase of pension to George Lappin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 4617) for the relief of James H. Gordon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4618) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Saint Peter, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEAL: A bill (H. R. 4619) for the relief of the Link-Belt Co., of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4620) for the relief of Th. Brovig as owner of the bark *Bennestvet*; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4621) for the relief of Gaetano Davide Olivari fu Fortunato, as managing owner of the Italian bark *Doris*; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4622) for the relief of the Lloyd Mediterraneo Societa Italiana di Navigazione, owners of the Italian steamer *Titanica*; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4623) for the relief of the Atlantic & Pacific Shipping and Brokerage Corporation of Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DREWRY: A bill (H. R. 4624) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Greensville, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4625) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hopewell, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4626) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Petersburg, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4627) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Farmville, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4628) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Waverly, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4629) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Brunswick, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4630) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Nottoway, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4631) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Lunenburg, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4632) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Mecklenburg, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4633) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Dinwiddie, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4634) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Surry, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4635) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Amelia, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4636) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Prince George, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4637) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Powhatan, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4638) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Sussex, State of Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 4639) granting a pension to Mary E. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4640) granting a pension to Jennie Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 4641) for the relief of Charles B. Beck; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4642) to carry out the findings of the United States Court of Claims in the case of Benjamin F. Hasson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 4643) granting a pension to Emerette McKernan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4644) granting a pension to John Nighswander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4645) granting a pension to Laura A. Bishop; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 4646) granting a pension to George F. Savage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 4647) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Joseph D. Wyatt; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 4648) granting a pension to Emma A. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4649) for the relief of Martha E. Conklin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 4650) granting a pension to Mary A. Spatch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 4651) for the relief of Chesley Thurber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAHN: A bill (H. R. 4652) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cleveland, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4653) for the relief of Allie Melinda Outterside; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4654) for the relief of the heirs of Frank Boddeker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GENSMAN: A bill (H. R. 4655) granting an increase of pension to Michael Balenti; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 4656) granting an increase of pension to Archie S. Blackmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4657) granting a pension to Nicholas Schiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 4658) for the relief of the estate of David B. Landis, deceased, and the estate of Jacob F. Shaeffer, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 4659) granting a pension to Thomas N. Swearingen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4660) granting a pension to Napoleon Bonaparte Corns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4661) granting a pension to Albert H. Ellwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4662) granting a pension to Mary Jane Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 4663) granting a pension to Mary E. Coss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 4664) granting a pension to Emilie Draves; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4665) granting a pension to Lewis E. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4666) granting a pension to Benjamin H. Britton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4667) for the relief of the First National Bank of New Carlisle, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4668) for the relief of Clara Percy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4669) for the relief of Belle Piatt Whyler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4670) for the relief of the heirs of Lewis J. Blair; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4671) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Joseph P. Leslie; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4672) for the relief of Joseph Santucci; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 4673) granting a pension to Stephen L. Tobey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4674) granting a pension to Levi S. Seeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4675) granting a pension to George Pendergast; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4676) granting a pension to Philo Lewis Kelsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4677) granting a pension to Wesley Sweet; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4678) granting an increase of pension to Percy D. Ganung; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4679) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4680) for the relief of Stephen W. Bates; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4681) for the relief of George W. Beavers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4682) for the relief of W. M. Middleton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4683) for the relief of John Davis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4684) for the relief of John P. Willard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4685) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Hendrix College, of Conway, State of Arkansas, two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4686) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Confederate Park at Charleston, State of Arkansas, two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4687) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Perryville, State of Arkansas, two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4688) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Danville, State of Arkansas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4689) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Morrilton, State of Arkansas, two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4690) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dardanelle, State of Arkansas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4691) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4692) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Clarksville, State of Arkansas, two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4693) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Russellville, State of Arkansas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4694) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Conway, State of Arkansas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4695) for the relief of the dependents of Lieuts. Jean Jagou and Fernand Herbert, French military mission to the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4696) granting six months' pay to Alice C. Pomroy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 4697) for the relief of Mason B. Crary; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 4698) granting a pension to James B. Mulford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 4699) granting a pension to Sarah Haddiman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4700) granting a pension to Mary A. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 4701) for the relief of Delia Russell McNamee; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 4702) granting a pension to Eugene C. Dempsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4703) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Nagel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4704) for the relief of Thomas H. Burgess; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 4705) for the relief of Gabriel Roth; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4706) to award a medal of honor to Ivory Pike; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 4707) to reimburse Earl V. Larkin for injuries sustained by the accidental discharge of a pistol in the hands of a soldier in the United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONTROYA: A bill (H. R. 4708) granting a pension to Mrs. Mattie Grimes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 4709) granting a pension to Juliet Ratchford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4710) granting a pension to Elmer Coe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4711) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Oswego Sanatorium, in the village of Orwell, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 4712) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ellen Bealer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4713) granting an increase of pension to John Coyne; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLPP: A bill (H. R. 4714) for the relief of Kate Coffin, Thomas Webster, and Herbert Liverani; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 4715) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Story; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4716) granting an increase of pension to Roy R. Hart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4717) granting an increase of pension to William H. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4718) granting an increase of pension to William Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4719) granting an increase of pension to Albert Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4720) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Christy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4721) granting a pension to Israel W. Bennett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 4722) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Frank T. Foster; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 4723) for the relief of William M. Phillipson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 4724) granting an increase of pension to Ella Broderick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4725) to correct the military record of Purdy Trager; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 4726) granting a pension to Alice Haskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4727) granting a pension to Mary J. Cordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4728) granting a pension to Frank C. Lee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 4729) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chillicothe, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4730) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hallsville, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4731) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Carbon Hill, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4732) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Frankfort, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4733) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Clarksburg, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4734) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bainbridge, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4735) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Londonderry, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4736) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lithopolis, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4737) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Stoutsville, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4738) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Murray, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4739) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Baltimore, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4740) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Kingston, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4741) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Richmondale, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4742) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Junction City, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4743) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Roseville, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4744) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Thornville, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4745) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Tarlton, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4746) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rushville, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4747) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ashville, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4748) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Carroll, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4749) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Amanda, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4750) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Laurelville, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4751) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Adelphi, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4752) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Holland, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4753) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Basil, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4754) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Darbyville, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4755) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Williamsport, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4756) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Union Furnace, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4757) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Haydenville, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 4758) to reimburse Hill County, State of Montana, for money expended for the support of the Rocky Boy Band of Chippewa Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENBLUM: A bill (H. R. 4759) granting a pension to Sarah M. J. Bertram; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 4760) granting an increase of pension to Kate Momper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 4761) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Clark Mills, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4762) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hinckley, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4763) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dolgeville, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4764) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West Winfield, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 4765) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Reynolds; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4766) granting a pension to Dustin D. Elsie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 4767) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Northwest School of Agriculture, of Crookston, county of Polk, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 4768) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hazleton, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 4769) for the relief of Mrs. John Hanlon; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 4770) for the relief of Joseph Woosley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4771) for the relief of C. M. Cole; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 4772) granting a pension to Anna L. Boggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 4773) granting an increase of pension to Fred O. Hamilton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 4774) granting a pension to Helen F. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOLK: A bill (H. R. 4775) for the relief of Theresa M. Shea; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4776) for the relief of Margaret Speir; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 4777) granting a pension to Grace E. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 4778) granting a pension to Eddie C. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4779) to correct the military record of Patterson Mehaflie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 4780) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Cusseta, State of Georgia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4781) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bowdon, State of Georgia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4782) for the relief of Preston Brooks Massey; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

200. By Mr. APPLEBY: Petition of the Citizens' Building & Loan Association, of Perth Amboy, N. J., recommending that the income tax law be amended so as to exempt income of profit derived from local building and loan investments to the extent of \$500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

201. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of members of Fresno Post, No. 4, American Legion, Department of California, urging enactment of the Kenyon bill (S. 4643) for the rehabilitation of disabled soldiers, to extend training to citizens serving in allied armies during the war, to allow training of all vocationally handicapped, to grant training to widows of soldiers, and relating to medical treatment and time limit for filing applications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

202. By Mr. COCKRAN: Petition of the Lest We Forget Committee, the City Gardens Club, and Women's Municipal League, of New York, favoring further legislation for the bene-

fit of disabled veterans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

203. By Mr. COLE: Petition of Bucyrus, Ohio, Division No. 193, Order of Railway Conductors, protesting against sales or turnover tax legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

204. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of Messrs. W. J. Nicholson, A. G. Prouty, and E. H. Amstutz, jewelers of Napa, Calif., indorsing a 1 per cent gross sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

205. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Conrad & Co., E. T. Slattery Co., A. Stowell & Co., and C. Crawford Hollidge, all of Boston, Mass., favoring a sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

206. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition from voters of Oshkosh, Wis., desiring the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

207. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of residents of forty-first district of New York, protesting against tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

208. Also, petition of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, protesting against proposed sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

209. Also, petition of Wildroot Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against proposed tax on tin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

210. Also, petition of the Lest We Forget Committee of New York, protesting against tax on tin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

211. By Mr. MONTROYA: Resolution by New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, regarding State control of public domain and Indian live stock; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

212. Also, petition of the New Mexico Wool Growers' Association, asking suspension of existing freight rates until July, pending permanent readjustment of same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

213. Also, petition of the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, regarding appropriation for destruction of predatory wild animals and range-destroying rodents; to the Committee on Appropriations.

214. Also, petition of the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, favoring pure-fabric legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

215. Also, petition of the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, regarding long-time loans to owners of breeding stock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

216. By Mr. MORIN: Twenty-four petitions bearing hundreds of names of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of beer and light wines and in opposition to Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

217. By Mr. SPROUL: Petitions of 308 citizens of the third congressional district of Illinois, protesting against the enactment of so-called Sunday blue laws and asking the amendment of the prohibition act to permit the sale of beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

218. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of S. H. Reynolds Sons Co., of Boston, Mass., concerning Senate bill 4927; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

219. Also, petition of Lockwood, Brackett & Co., of Boston, Mass., concerning ad valorem duties on imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

220. Also, petition of F. C. Henderson Co., of Boston, Mass., concerning revision of existing tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

221. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., for repeal of 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

222. Also, petition of Ancient Order of Hibernians, through its national secretary, petitioning for recognition of the republic of Ireland by the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

223. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., for the recognition of the republic of Ireland by the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

224. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of New Castle Division, No. 326, Order of Railway Conductors, representing the railway conductors employed on the Erie and Ashtabula division of the Pennsylvania Railroad, protesting against the repeal of the excess-profits tax and the enactment of a sales or turnover tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

225. Also, protest of Tin City Division, No. 565, Mahoningtown, Pa., against the enactment of a sales-tax law and the repeal of excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

226. Also, petition of F. C. Doeschmer, of Pittsburgh, Pa., requesting the repeal of tax on furs and advocating the adoption of the proposed sales tax or turnover tax law of 1 per cent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

227. Also, petition of Edwin R. Dodge, Philadelphia, Pa., requesting repeal of tax on fur goods and supporting the enactment of a gross sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

228. Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., supporting the proposal to incorporate in tariff legislation what are known as bargaining provisions, in order that the Executive may have the means of taking defensive measures against the products of any country which discriminates against American products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

229. Also, resolution of the Chartiers Valley Central Labor Union, of Canonsburg, Pa., indorsing the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

230. Also, resolutions of Chartiers Valley Central Labor Union, Canonsburg, Pa., demanding the immediate release and the granting of amnesty to all persons whose political beliefs formed the basis of their imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

231. Also, petitions from Henry Newman and others, of Cross Creek Township, Washington County, Pa., and American Flint Glass Workers' Local Union, No. 25, Rochester, Pa., protesting against the enactment of the Capper-Fess bill; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 21, 1921.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee that Thou hast told us in Thy Word that they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint. Grant that this may be to us not simply an expression of Scriptural truth but a realization in our hearts and lives, so that we may realize that as the day is so shall our strength be. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, April 18, 1921, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, containing a statement of files of papers which are not needed in the transaction of business of the Department of Labor and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Vice President appointed Mr. KENYON and Mr. JONES of New Mexico members of the committee on the part of the Senate and ordered that the Secretary of the Senate notify the House of Representatives thereof.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2185) providing for a "Pageant of Progress Exposition" cancellation stamp to be used by the Chicago post office, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a memorial of St. Johns Division, No. 196, Order of Railway Conductors, of Jacksonville, Fla., remonstrating against the passage of a sales tax law and the repeal of the excess-profits tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Anthony, Ocala, Kendrick, and Sparr, all in the State of Florida, remonstrating against any increase in tariff on coal-tar products used in the manufacture of dips and disinfectants by farmers and stock raisers, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of 251 citizens of New York and New Jersey praying for the enactment of legislation for the recognition of the Irish republic, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.